




THE UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS
LIBRARY

052
eR
v. 115

100
100



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2021 with funding from
University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign Alternates

LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

THE
CONTEMPORARY
REVIEW.

VOLUME CXV. JANUARY—JUNE, 1919.

LONDON;

THE CONTEMPORARY REVIEW COMPANY LIMITED

10, ADELPHI TERRACE, LONDON, W.C. 2

1919.

UNIVERSITY OF YORKE
LIBRARY
YORK

CONTENTS OF VOLUME CXV.

JANUARY, 1919.		PAGE
Prospects and Tasks of Social Reconstruction.	By B. Seeböhm Rowntree ...	1
President Wilson and the Peace Settlement.	By Lord Parmoor ...	10
The Repartition of Africa.	By Sir Sydney Olivier, K.C.M.G., C.B. ...	15
Indian Constitutional Reforms.	By Sir Andrew Fraser, K.C.S.I. ...	23
Barnett of Toynbee Hall.	By Harold Spender ...	31
The Truth About the Fifth Army.	By Hamilton Fyfe ...	38
Downfall.	By Hugh F. Spender ...	47
Factors in Poland.	By O. de L. ...	54
Spain and The Allies.	By Aubrey F. G. Bell ...	62
Domestic Idiocies.	By Clementina Black ...	67
The Earliest Surviving Book by a British Author.	By Professor A. Souter ...	76
A League of Nations and a Change of Heart.	By The Rev. J. P. Maleson ...	83
Continued Education and Boy Labour.	By The Rev. Spencer J. Gibb ...	89
How Dog Stealers Work.	By Charles R. Johns ...	95
Literary Supplement:—		
The New Orestes	By J. E. G. de Montmorency ...	101
Reviews of Books: Lord Bryce's Addresses; Rebuilding Britain; Belief and Faith; Tales of the Sorbonne; The Canadian Constitution, &c.	105

FEBRUARY, 1919.

The General Election and After.	I. By The Right Hon. C. F. G. Masterman	121
	II. By Sir Alfred Hopkinson, K.C., LL.D.	131
	III. By Aneurin Williams, M.P.	139
Justice and Conciliation in the Balkans.	By James D. Bouchier	145
The Unity of the Greek Race.	By Ronald M. Burrows, D.Litt.	153
The Historic Claim of Belgium to Luxembourg.	By Demetrius C. Boulger	165
Tyrol as a Republic.	By W. A. Baillie-Grohman	171
<i>Sinn Féin</i> Trials and Parliamentary Disqualification.	By J. O. Herdman	177
The Khanates of the Middle East.	By Ikbāl Ali Shah	183
Edmond Rostand.	By The Count de Soissons	188
The Demobilisation of Juvenile Workers.	By Miss B. L. Hutchins	196
Should Government Continue to Control Industry After the War?	By A. Wigglesworth	202
A Strange New World.	By The Right. Hon. Sir Joseph Compton-Rickett, M.P.	210
London Mothers and "American Women."	By Mrs. Graham Wallas	216
Literary Supplement:—		
The House Not Made with Hands.	By J. E. G. de Montmorency	221
Reviews of Books: The League of Nations; Battles for Peace; The Church and Continuation Schools; Reconstruction of Family Life; Nationalism and Catholicism		226

MARCH, 1919.

The Congress of Paris. By Major-General Sir Frederick Maurice, K.C.M.G., C.B.	241
The European Famine. By Professor Gilbert Murray	250
The Industrial Future. By The Right Hon. J. M. Robertson	257
The Rise, Decline and Fall of Young Turkey. By Sir Edwin Pears	264
The London County Council Election. By The Rev. Dr. J. Scott Lidgett	273
Japan at Kiaochau and the Peace Conference. By Robert Young	277
China at the Peace Conference By S. G. Cheng	289
The Papacy and the War. By The Rev. Alfred Fawkes	295
Léon Bourgeois: An Apostle of Peace By Charles Dawbarn	304
League or Federation? By Edward Jenks	309
The Trentino of Greece. By M. G. Chrussachi	314
The Administration of Military Law. By Major Gerald B. Hurst, M.P.	321
Impressions of Smyrna in War Time. By Annie C. Marshall	328
Milton and Music. By The Rev. A. H. Moncur Sime	337
Literary Supplement:—	
The Ending of the Road. By J. E. G. de Montmorency	341
Reviews of Books: The City of Trouble; The Prelude to Bolshevism; Plotinus and Mysticism; Bismarck and William II.; A German League of Nations	342

INDEX.

PAGE

APRIL, 1919.

The Industrial Unrest : A New Policy Required. By The Right Hon. Arthur Henderson	361
Germany Tries Democracy. By Edwyn Bevan	369
The Financial Situation and the Way Out. By E. Hilton Young, D.S.O. M.P.	376
The Prospects of Starting State Forestry. By The Right Hon. F. D. Acland, M.P.	386
A New Liberal Programme : Liberalism and Labour. By Percy Alden	396
President Wilson, in Europe and America. By S. K. Ratcliffe	404
Albania at the Peace Conference. By H. Charles Woods	411
Man and the Machine. By Arthur Ponsonby	418
The Dissolution of the Russian Empire. By Edward Foord	425
New Wine in Old Bottles. By Mrs. Creighton	431
The Future of Medicine. By Sir James Mackenzie	437
Sleeping Heroes. By Mrs. E. M. Field	444
Nursery Schools. By Margaret Drummond	451
Literary Supplement :—	
The Acadian. By J. E. G. de Montmorency	461
Reviews of Books : Eastern Europe; International Spiritual Sanctuaries; Rome; Romantic Literature; The Near East	465

MAY, 1919

The Peace Conference : An Estimate of Forces. By A. F. Whyte	481
The Problem of Egypt. By The Right Hon. J. M. Robertson	490
Northern Epirus : An Importunate Question. By E. Hilton Young, M.P., D.S.O.	497
International Labour Legislation. By C. Delisle Burns	503
Finland's Independence and Its Recognition. By Dr. J. N. Reuter	511
National Health. By Sir Arthur Newsholme, K.C.B.	517
Ireland Past and Present. By Hugh A. Law	523
Overseas Soldiers in British Homes. By Harold Spender	530
Hopes of Better Housing. By Clementina Black	536
Redress of Grievances in the Army. By Major Gerald B. Hurst, M.P.	542
Religion and Reality. By The Rev. Principal Forsyth, D.D.	548
Three Great Air Fighters. By John Steel	555
The Truth about the Stage. By William Poel	563
The Future of Portugal. By Aubrey F. E. Bell	568
Legal Unity and Legislative Research. By C. E. A. Bedwell	572
Hawks and Owls in Relation to Agriculture. By Walter S. Collinge, D.Sc.	576
Literary Supplement :—	
The Magic Bowl of Baghdad. By J. E. G. de Montmorency	581
Reviews of Books : Theories of the State; Chronology of the War; Italy and Her War; Henry Barclay Swete; English Liturgical Colours, &c.	585

JUNE, 1919.

Our Financial Plight. By The Right Hon. Walter Runciman	601
Prospects in Russia. By Sir Paul Vinogradoff	606
The Germans at Versailles. By Sisley Huddleston	613
Whither Drifts India? By St. Nihal Singh	620
The Future of Turkey. By H. Charles Woods	628
South Africa : A Golden Opportunity. By John H. Harris	637
The Employment of the War Disabled. By H. Sidebotham	644
Mr. Chamberlain's After-War Budget. By W. M. J. Williams	651
Art in France During the War. By The Count de Soissons	658
The Religion of Robinson Crusoe. By The Rev. Dr. James Moffatt	664
The Centenary of Charles Kingsley. By Lewis Melville	670
The Illiberal Nature of the Anti-Vivisection Campaign. By W. E. Bullock, M.D.	675
Hindrances to Belief in Immortality. By The Rev. Dr. Samuel McComb	680
The Revolt of the Hidden Hand. By William Hill	691
Literary Supplement :—	
The Audacious Twins. By J. E. G. de Montmorency	697
Reviews of Books : The Oxford History of India; The Risorgimento; An English Prison; Oxford after the War; The Venerable Bede	702
Index to Vol. CXV.	717

21301
129

PROSPECTS AND TASKS OF SOCIAL RECONSTRUCTION.

WHEN we consider the task of social reconstruction which lies before us in the new year, we realise how vast it is. Indeed, we have to lay the foundations of a new world. Whether we like it or not, we have definitely broken with the past. The furnace of war has consumed many of the old beliefs which regulated our social and industrial life, and has liberated new forces, new ideas, and new ideals. Our immediate object must be to direct and control these so wisely that the new world shall be a fairer one than that which is passing away. Our immediate effort should be directed, not to the creation of a perfect whole as by the waving of a magician's wand, but to laying the foundations on which a perfect whole may subsequently be erected. I shall therefore deal with the establishment, in different spheres of our social and industrial life, of minimum conditions under which every citizen should have an opportunity of living. To do this the more conveniently, I will take first material conditions, and next opportunities for the development of human personality.

(I) MINIMUM STANDARD OF MATERIAL CONDITIONS.

Wages.

The first material condition to which I will refer is the wage of the worker. It is futile to attempt to build up an ideal social structure until minimum wages are paid which will enable men and women to meet "the normal needs of the average employee regarded as a human being living in a civilised community." It is important that we should draw a clear distinction between minimum wages and wages above the minimum. The former should be determined by human needs, the latter by the market value of the services rendered. It is the function of the State, acting in the interests of the whole community, to secure for all workers an adequate minimum. This minimum will be different for men and women, for under our present system the man is normally responsible for providing for the family, while the woman worker is normally responsible only for her own maintenance.* The minimum wages of the man should be sufficient to enable him to marry, to live in a decent house, and to bring up a family of normal size in a state of physical efficiency, while allowing a reasonable margin for contingencies and recreation. The wages of women should allow them to maintain themselves in health and comfort, in respectable surroundings, with, similarly, something over for contingencies and recreation. In the past, mil-

* I cannot here enter into the evidence on which I base this statement. Briefly, however, 90 per cent. of the men marry and become responsible for dependants, while such investigations as have been made indicate that only a small minority of women workers are responsible for the maintenance of dependants, and that where there is such responsibility, it is due to accidents or misfortunes, such as the death, illness, or unemployment of the male wage earner. The need arising out of such misfortunes should be met directly, and not by drawing on the wages of women workers. I deal with this question at length in *The Human Needs of Labour*, Nelson & Sons, 3s. 6d.

nions of workers have been in receipt of wages which did not permit them to live in accordance with this very moderate standard. As I have shown elsewhere* it involves the payment of not less than 44s. a week to men and 25s. a week to women, on the assumption that prices drop to 25 per cent. above the 1914 level. If they fail to do so, wages would, of course, be correspondingly higher. I do not think that the State need concern itself with wages above the minimum. Their settlement and readjustment in relation to minimum wages may be left to employers and Trade Unions. I think, however, that women should be given similar opportunities to those of men, in entering all industries and professions, and should receive pay equal to that of men for output which is equal both in quality and quantity.

We must now ask whether industry can afford the substantial addition to the wage-bill suggested above—an addition which, judging from such figures as are available, will run into hundreds of millions of pounds per year. This increase can only be raised in three ways. In certain cases, the whole or part of it may come from profits in excess of those necessary to maintain the industry in a financially sound position. The reduction of profits to this level need not alarm us; but I am confident that only a small part of the sum required can be drawn from this source.

The second possible method of meeting a larger wage bill is to increase the selling price of the goods produced. Little, however, can be looked for here. What the worker needs is *real* wages, and if the cost of the articles he buys is raised, his wages must be raised in a corresponding degree, if a given standard of comfort is to be maintained. It is important to keep this fact clearly in mind, for it has an important bearing on our fiscal policy. If protective tariffs are imposed which enable manufacturers to charge higher prices for their products the cost of living will rise, and the object we are seeking to achieve, raising real wages, will be defeated.

We turn now to the third possible method of increasing the wage fund, namely, greater efficiency in the production of goods, and the experience of the last four years has shown how great are the possibilities in this direction. By scientific research, by the application of its results to industry, and by improvements in industrial administration, including the introduction into every factory of a complete costing system, economies can be effected, the extent of which no man can measure. Thousands of manufacturers at the present time believe conscientiously that it would be impossible to make any substantial addition to their wage bill without going into bankruptcy, and would willingly throw their books open to prove their contention. Once faced, however, with the unavoidable necessity of raising wages, industry would so organise itself as rapidly to increase its efficiency, and thus create a new source of wealth.

Coming to practical measures, I suggest that in all industries Trade Boards should be set up upon which Parliament should place the statutory duty of raising wages within a clearly prescribed period of, say, five, or at any rate not more than seven years, to a level which will enable the lowest grade of workers to live in accordance with the standard of life which I have outlined above. Some industries would be able

* *The Human Needs of Labour*, Nelson.

to reach this minimum at once, others, where the average profits are lower, could only do so if time were given them to introduce substantial improvements in their methods. But it is essential that a time limit should be fixed in advance within which every industry must pay the prescribed minimum wages.

But what is to be done with industries which, after making all reasonable efforts, are still unable to comply with the regulation? In so far as these are non-essential, they must, I think, be regarded as parasitic, and their retention as of no advantage to the State. But there is one industry, namely agriculture, where the payment of the prescribed minimum may involve serious difficulties. Limitations of space preclude my discussion of these at any length, and I will only mention two points.

(1) The average production per acre and per unit of labour is very much lower than the production of the best cultivated farms either in this country or abroad, a fact which shows that there is room for greatly increased efficiency in farming. One of the earliest tasks of reconstruction should be to take such steps as may render agriculture more efficient.

(2) If it is found necessary to grant any State assistance to farmers in order to enable them to pay the prescribed minimum wage, this must not be given in a form which will raise the cost of food-stuffs. The great bulk of the produce grown in this country is consumed by working people, and consequently an increase in its price would only involve a corresponding increase in the minimum wage.

Nationalisation of Industries.

In reorganising industry, with a view to its greater productivity and the avoidance of wasteful methods, we may in some cases best achieve the desired end by nationalisation. All industries should be conducted in the interests of the community as a whole, and if those interests can best be served by the nation's taking over a particular industry, we should not hesitate to adopt such a course. Enormous economies have resulted from national control of the railways during the war, and the complete nationalisation of this all-important industry, which we see foreshadowed, will probably be a step in the right direction. How far it would be wise to extend this policy is a question which cannot be answered off-hand, but an early investigation should be made regarding the advisability of nationalising canals, mines, insurance, banking, afforestation, the supply of electric power, and possibly other industries.

There is one industry in particular for the nationalisation of which a clear case has already been made out. I refer to the drink trade. No one will dispute the great advantage which has resulted from the stringent control over the sale of drink which has been exercised during the war by the Liquor Control Board. The Act under which that control was exercised comes to an end twelve months after the termination of the war, and before that date the nation will have to decide upon its future policy. There are three courses open. One, which has many advocates, is the entire prohibition of drink throughout the United Kingdom. We must remember, however, that even in the darkest days of the war, when the submarine menace made it most urgently necessary to conserve our food supplies, and to keep our national efficiency unimpaired, the Government dared not adopt

this policy, in view of the adverse public opinion that it might arouse. The second course open to us is to leave the trade in private hands, while maintaining a stricter control over it than before the war. But sixty years of temperance effort have shown how slight is the prospect of passing legislation which will result in a material reduction in the consumption of alcohol, so long as the monopoly right to sell drink is vested in a trade whose primary interest is to sell as much as possible. The consumption of beer per head of the population is higher now than it was sixty years ago, and that of spirits only slightly less. There remains a third alternative, namely, to nationalise the trade, and thus do away with all financial interest in the sale of drink. It is a significant sign of the trend of public opinion that State Purchase, plus Local Option, has become the official aim of organised democracy. The British Labour Party, at its recent conference, passed the following resolution: "That the Conference records its sense of the great social evil and national waste caused by the excessive consumption of alcoholic liquors, and by the unfortunate intemperance of a relatively small section of the population; that the Conference sees the key to temperance reform in taking the entire manufacture and retailing of alcoholic drink out of the hands of those who find profit in promoting the utmost possible consumption, and the Conference holds that in conjunction with any expropriation of the private interests the electors of each locality should be enabled to decide, as they may see fit, (1) to prohibit the sale of alcoholic drink within their own boundaries; (2) to reduce the number of places of sale, and to regulate the conditions of sale; (3) to determine, within the fundamental conditions prescribed by Statute, the manner in which the public places of refreshment and social intercourse in their own districts should be organised and controlled."

That this course is financially practicable has been shown by the three Government Committees appointed to enquire into the terms upon which the interests concerned in the manufacture and supply of intoxicating liquor in England and Wales, Scotland, and Ireland should be acquired. If once the financial interest in the sale of drink disappears, there is nothing to prevent the immediate enactment of such legislation for lessening the consumption as public opinion may demand. The objections raised to this policy by a section of the temperance party, however sincere, will not, to my mind, stand logical analysis.

Housing.

Before the war there was a shortage of houses in half the towns of England and Wales, and in most country districts. Five or ten per cent. of the population lived in slums, and half the houses in the country had only two bedrooms or less. Not only was there overcrowding per house, but in towns houses were usually built 30, 40, and even 50 to the acre. How dreary working-class districts are we all know too well. But though conditions were bad in 1914, they are much worse to-day owing to the practical cessation of building during the war. Even if we leave Scotland out of account, we should have to build over 300,000 houses before the end of 1919 in England and Wales merely to make up for the additional shortage thus created. We see, then, that in spite of the enormous cost of building at the present time, the national need is so urgent that

we cannot afford to postpone this great task. The Government has realised the gravity of the position, and promised a substantial subsidy to those who build at this time of abnormally high prices. As, however, it is in the highest degree unlikely that Parliament would grant subsidies to those who build for profit, it may be assumed that practically all working-class houses during the next two or three years will be built by Local Authorities, employing builders on contract. Now, this gives us a unique opportunity of improving the standard of housing. The Government will only grant a subsidy for houses which come up to a certain level of excellence as regards planning and lay-out, and it has stated that, save in exceptional cases, houses should be laid out not more than eight to the acre in the country and twelve to the acre in towns. Thus we may break completely with the past in the matter of working-class housing, and create a fresh tradition. Let us realise our personal responsibility. The matter must not be left to the Government or Local Authorities. Many of the latter are apathetic, and their ideals in the matter of house building are low. Left to themselves, they will submit very mediocre schemes to the Central Authority, and the pressure at the centre will be so great that such schemes may be passed simply to avoid delay. To avert this danger, local unofficial committees should be set up everywhere, to stimulate and educate public opinion. These committees should find out what action their Local Authorities are taking, and whether schemes are prepared which are satisfactory both as regards the quality of the houses and the number it is proposed to build. If this is not the case, they must put pressure on the Council, confronting it with a sheer determination on the part of the public to put up with nothing short of the best. If we can get several hundred thousand really good houses erected during the next few years, we shall at least make it easier for others to "build Jerusalem in England's green and pleasant land." Meanwhile, the houses which we build must be planned and laid out by qualified architects; due attention must be given to their appearance, and practically all of them should have at least three bedrooms and a bathroom. Fortunately the standard of comfort is rising among the working classes, and it would be false economy to ignore this fact in the construction of houses which are to last for a century.

When the present need for new houses has been partially met, a determined attack must be made on the slums. In the old world, which is passing away, we were accustomed to think of slums as inevitable. In the new world we must regard them as intolerable. If the national loss due to unhealthy housing conditions could be shown in tabular form, I believe that the sum total would both amaze and appal us. Bad housing and overcrowding undermine the national physique; they lower the national standard of morality and common decency, and they destroy the sense of citizenship, creating in its stead a spirit of brooding, sullen resentment. Of course, I know that the abolition of slums is a task of enormous magnitude, but this fact should deepen our determination rather than cause us dismay.

A Minimum of Economic Security.

I now pass to another important reform which is doubly necessary at the present time. It concerns the economic security of the workers.

It is not enough for them to have satisfactory minimum wages, and good houses, if they and their families are liable at any moment to be plunged into serious privation, and possibly destitution, through causes which they cannot control. It is essential to the well-being of the community that all its members should know that if they do their best to fulfil their duties as citizens a reasonable standard of life is secured to them. We should at once remove the fear of unemployment which broods over so many households. The problem must be attacked from two standpoints. In the first place, every effort must be made to reduce the amount of unemployment, and in the second, adequate provision must be made for those who are unavoidably unemployed. Until this has been done we cannot expect, nor do we deserve, the hearty co-operation of the workers in increasing the efficiency of industry. So long as they feel that the introduction of labour-saving machinery, or improved methods, may throw some of them out of work, they will regard such innovations with suspicion and distrust. It is useless to tell a man who is discharged, or sees his mate discharged, that in the long run improved methods will operate to the advantage of the workers. Every employer who wants his workers to co-operate with him in rendering the industry more efficient, instead of restricting their output, should do his very utmost to guarantee them against consequent dismissal. This would mean that occasionally it would be necessary to find work for men who might otherwise be dispensed with. But there is always a leakage of workers from natural causes from every factory, and any temporary surplus of labour caused by the introduction of some improved process could soon be absorbed. Even where individual employers could not give satisfactory guarantees, these could probably be given by the industry as a whole, and opportunities for experiments in this direction will occur now that industrial councils, which will, we hope, do so much to raise the status of the worker, are being widely organised.

But unemployment may not be the result of the improvement of processes of production, but of trade depression, and in that case much might be done if the State and local authorities kept back work which could be deferred, that it might be forthcoming in "slack" periods.

It may be said, however, that since the demand for labour is not absolutely regular, it is of great advantage to industry to have a small reserve which may be drawn upon when the need arises. If that is the case, surely industry should pay any costs which the retention of such a reserve may involve. Taking one year with another, 95 per cent. of the workers are employed, and 5 per cent. unemployed. Such a margin of unemployed might well be reduced, but apart from its reduction, industry could provide a fund sufficient to make adequate provision for all unemployed persons, without imposing on itself any intolerable burden. We ought at once to make insurance against unemployment universal and compulsory, and so to increase out-of-work benefit that if men or women were unavoidably unemployed, they would still be in receipt of an income which, though less than they would earn if working, would safeguard them against starvation or serious disaster. Some years ago I made a close study of the problem of unemployment in the City of York,* and enquired into the industrial history of 1,200 persons

* *Unemployment: A Social Study*. Macmillan, 5s.

who were unemployed on a given date. That investigation showed me how serious and far-reaching are the effects of unemployment on the workers. It leads to both physical and moral deterioration. At present, when the industries of the country are being transferred from the activities of war to the activities of peace, there will be a vast dislocation. It is the duty of the State to make adequate provision for all who are unavoidably unemployed. But I would also urge employers everywhere to do all in their power to lessen the number of unemployed persons. It is unjust that the main burden of loss and suffering caused by a great transition should fall on the workers. Employers may argue that many workers have earned high wages during the war, and ought to have saved money to carry them over some months of dislocation. But the workers may justly retort that many employers have made extremely high profits during the war, and may reasonably be asked to retain a larger working staff than may be absolutely necessary through the period of exceptional stress. Let every employer ask himself whether he is doing his utmost in this difficult crisis. Let him consider the effect of his actions upon the national well-being, as well as upon his balance-sheet.

Intimately associated with the question of economic security is the duty of making adequate provision for disabled soldiers, and for the widows and orphans of those who have fallen in the war. I need not discuss a question with regard to which I believe that the conscience of the nation is thoroughly awake. But a word may be said on the subject of widows' pensions. We all agree that the State has a definite responsibility towards the widows and children of soldiers. But it is also responsible for safeguarding the widows and children of the industrial army, whose efforts are essential to its welfare. To-day, if a workman dies, the community offers his widow two alternatives. She may eke out a miserable existence by neglecting her home and going out charring, unless she is fortunate enough to get inadequate "out relief." Or she may go to the work-house. This state of things must cease. We have accepted a social system under which the husband is responsible for the maintenance of his wife and family, and if, through death or illness, he is no longer able to make provision for them, the State must take his place. The quickened sense of solidarity which the war has awakened has opened our eyes to this imperative duty. The scheme of widows' pensions adopted in America has pointed out the way to better things, and action along similar lines should at once be undertaken.

There is another matter to which I may here refer. When dealing with the question of minimum wages, I suggested that the minimum wage for a man should be based on the assumption that only three dependent children should be provided for. But investigations which I have recently made* have shown that more than half the children of the working classes belong to families where for periods of five years or more the number of children dependent on the father's earnings is in excess of three. Thus, if a minimum wage is based on the needs of families with three dependent children, more than half the children of families living on the minimum wage will be inadequately maintained for at least five years. Now, it is

* *Human Needs of Labour*. Nelson, 3s. 6d.

imperative in the interests of the community that all its members should be provided with the necessities of life; and yet I do not believe that within the next few years minimum wages could be generally adopted much in excess of those which I have recommended above. It seems to me that the State must step in and solve the problem. My proposal is that industry should be required to pay minimum wages which will meet the needs of a family with three dependent children, while the State should make a grant to families during the period when the number of dependent children exceeds three. Unless this is done, we shall continue to bring up millions of our children ill-housed, ill-clothed, and underfed. A healthy and efficient race cannot be reared in this way. The suggestion I make is not really revolutionary. By the rebate of income tax, the State practically makes a grant in support of children belonging to families whose total income, though it does not exceed a certain figure, does exceed £130. Surely the case for grants to poorer families is yet stronger. I estimate that the total cost of such a subsidy as I recommend would be perhaps eight millions a year.

(2) MINIMUM OPPORTUNITY FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF HUMAN PERSONALITY.

Hitherto I have dealt with the material needs of our citizens. Now we must consider their mental and ethical needs.

Hours of Work.

Railway workers have recently won what they have striven after for many years, namely, the enactment of an eight hours' working day. This is a step in the right direction, and one which should be rapidly followed in industry generally. We are creatures of routine, but when circumstances force us to ask whether the conditions which we have accepted without demur are really inevitable, we often find that they are nothing of the kind. Men and women start work at six in the morning not because it is necessary, but because they have always done so, and their fathers and grandfathers did so before them. There is, of course, a point in every industry below which hours cannot be reduced without lessening output; and adequate output is essential to the payment of an adequate wage. But a great mass of evidence shows that in most, if not all industries, it would be possible to lower the working hours to 48 per week without reduction of output, or with a reduction so small that it could easily be made up by improvements in administration. I think that it is time to dispense with work before breakfast, which is notoriously uneconomic, and to establish an all-round eight hours' working day. The change would have many indirect effects. It would give the worker a much wider choice of residence, enabling him to live further from the factory, and, if he likes, to take a house with a garden in the suburbs. It would lessen his fatigue. A man or woman who leaves home between five and six every morning, summer and winter, and does not return till five or six at night, cannot be expected to spend the evenings in any serious occupation. In view of the growing responsibilities falling on the democracy, the intelligent study of social, economic and political questions is a matter of first importance. But study is quite impossible without

adequate leisure. Fortunately, the first great step towards improving the education of the community has been taken in the passing of the recent Education Act, which will soon come into operation. Not the least important task of social reconstruction in the coming year will be to see that full advantage is taken of the opportunities provided by this Act. Local Authorities must make the necessary provision for teaching adolescents, not in any humdrum fashion, but in such a way as to inspire them with a love for learning. Let us completely banish the idea that workers only need a smattering of the three R's, and regard each child who enters a continuation class as a citizen upon whom heavy responsibilities will rest in the future. A good deal will depend on the attitude of employers. If they make the children feel that their liberation for the purpose of attending classes for eight hours a week is an unmitigated nuisance, they will largely neutralise any benefits derived from the teaching. But if they approach the difficulties involved in a generous spirit, and encourage the children to utilise their fresh opportunities, they will help to raise the educational standard of the community. But we must not rest content with the education of young people. There is a widespread demand for knowledge on the part of adult workers, to which the experience of the Workers' Educational Association bears eloquent testimony, and with increased leisure their demand will grow. It is supremely important that it should be met. Educational Settlements should be set up in every town, and the education given must not be merely utilitarian. We do not want to turn out a vast army of shorthand typists, but to give men and women a wider outlook on the great problems of life, some acquaintance with literature and art, some historical perspective, and some knowledge of economic science and international relationships. Government by an educated democracy is the safest government in the world: government by an uneducated democracy, which falls an easy prey to every specious demagogue, is a national menace.

I have outlined some of the problems which press most urgently for solution during the coming year. But in connection with them all, and with the whole future of society and of industry, we must never forget that the spirit in which we approach the new age is even more important than administrative machinery or legislative enactments. The war has widened both our sympathies and our ideals—do not let them contract again with the return of peace! The presence in our midst of masses of ill-paid labour, and millions of human beings living in slums, bears melancholy witness to our indifference in the past to the true welfare of the State. Our parsimonious expenditure on education, and the under-payment of our teachers, have been the measure of our apathy in dealing with the right of every citizen to a good mental equipment. The future must provide greater equality of opportunity for all. Extremes of riches and of poverty must both disappear. To a degree which perhaps we hardly recognise, the nation's future depends on the willingness of the well-to-do not only to acquiesce in, but to hasten every social and economic change that is to the advantage of the whole community.

B. SEEBOHM ROWNTREE.

PRESIDENT WILSON AND THE PEACE SETTLEMENT.

PRESIDENT WILSON stands out as the Protagonist in his advocacy of the League of Nations. It is not too much to say that, but for his support, the prospect of the constitution of an effective League of Nations would be hopeless. The traditions of European diplomacy, and the completeness of the victory of the Allies, would have stifled voices raised on behalf of a new order in International relations. It must be recognised that success is not dependent on what Lord Robert Cecil, in his admirable address at Birmingham, called peroration, or on the more laborious explanation of practical detail. It is no use to appeal to deaf ears, however eloquent is the language. If the advocates of a League of Nations are to obtain any measure of success, it can only be obtained by giving a whole-hearted support to the policy of President Wilson. This policy represents all that phase of American opinion which is earnestly desirous that, in international intercourse, the spirit of right and mutual co-operation should supersede the bitterness of violence and racial animosity, and is convinced that there is no insuperable difficulty in the adjustment of detail. There is the further consideration, which must not be overlooked, that this country is pledged in honour to support President Wilson. The Armistice was not asked for by Germany until after a direct appeal to President Wilson, and until the Allies had assented to the terms formulated by him, subject only to certain definite reservations. The keynote of those terms, the pivotal hinge on which they all depend, is that an effective League of Nations shall be constituted as an indispensable instrumentality, if permanency of peace is to be secured. Unless this condition is fulfilled the whole framework breaks down, and already a disposition has been shown to impose terms on Germany which are not included in the points of President Wilson, and which cannot fairly be inserted under any principle of reasonable implication.

America, both as a neutral and as a belligerent, has consistently supported an effective League of Nations as the chief hope of a new order in international reconstruction. It is not surprising that America should adopt a wider outlook than European countries, which for centuries have been immersed in the race for power and the desire of territorial aggrandisement. Immediately on the outbreak of war America took action, and founded, under the presidency of ex-President Taft, a League to enforce peace, which is merely another name for a League of Nations. This League was from the start warmly supported by President Wilson, and there has been no departure from its main principles. It was said that "Right thinking men of every land resolved within a week of the tragedy of the present war that it should never be repeated if they could help it," and "that it was inevitable that some sort of creative action should follow . . . that would provide something which would take the place of slaughter in settling some, if not all, future international disputes." The creative action here referred to eventuated in the formation in America of a League of Nations under the name of a League to enforce peace. There is every

reason why the two great Anglo-Saxon communities should work together in promoting this beneficent policy. They are common heirs of the principles enunciated in the Great Charter, on which the whole subsequent progress of our ordered liberty and freedom, under the restraint of a rule of Law, has been gradually evolved. They apply the same principles of Common Law and largely appeal to the same legal precedents. In truth it may be said that the American resolution is a re-statement in a slightly different form of the original objects with which this country undertook the burden and duty of war, and from which no departure should be made however complete the victory has been. There was a practical unanimity that we desired to put an end to an arrogant Militarism, and at the same time enforce a recognition of an adequate standard of international duty. If one matter has been established beyond all question, during the many discussions on the principle of the League of Nations, it is, that this result can only be obtained by this one method, and that to fail in this respect is to abandon a fair prospect, and to relegate all who have hoped for a better future to a sense of despair.

In September, in a speech at New York, President Wilson re-stated the issues involved in the war, and formulated certain points on which an enduring peace might be made without compromise or bargaining. It is necessary that these points should be fully observed if an effective League of Nations is to be constituted. It must be recognised that the terms of Peace are an essential element in future international reconstruction, and that there can be no expectation of a general assent to their permanency, unless they are based on the principles of an all-round fair treatment, and of justice accorded in an equal scale to the belligerents, as well as to the Allies. To put the matter quite shortly, a League of Nations is quite inconsistent with the spirit of revenge, or with the desire to humiliate Germany under the imposition of terms destructive to the reorganisation of her national life. "All who are at the Peace table," says President Wilson, "must be ready to pay the price, and the price is impartial justice, no matter whose interest is crossed." This is not an easy lesson for a nation to learn in the flush of victory, and it demands a very different plane of action from that comprised in the cry of revenge against a ruler, who, during the war, has represented the Government of a belligerent nation, and in relation to whom it is said that some jurists have discovered a novel principle, on which to found a claim for extradition. In the same speech President Wilson used his often quoted expression that a League of Nations is the indispensable instrumentality of a Peace Conference, an expression which aptly summarises a fundamental principle of a wide-reaching influence and importance.

The five conditions of peace which President Wilson stated in the same speech should be supported without reservation; but again the observation must be made that they are not easy of acceptance by a victorious country and that they have not been prominently endorsed either in election addresses or in platform speeches during the election. The definition of impartial justice, as involving no discrimination between those to whom we wish to be just and those to whom we wish to be unjust, is an endorsement for practical application of the ideal contained in the Sermon on the Mount. It

brings home the close connection between the teaching of Christian ethics and the principle of a League of Nations and enables the statement to be made that, in substance, a League of Nations is the expression in a substantive and concrete form of the vital Christian truth that all mankind should be regarded as one brotherhood under the protection of a Common Father. The late Dean Milman, speaking with all knowledge derived from his wide range of historical research, selected this truth as the central pillar of Christianity, as essentially the new revelation, which is not to be found in any branch of the large mass of oriental literature, which has reference to religious and metaphysical exposition.

It would be superfluous to restate all the terms contained in the five conditions of President Wilson, but each one of them is of the first importance if a League of Nations is to become a reality. It is of course necessary that the Allies should consider in careful collaboration the terms of peace which they may be prepared to propose or accept; but, on the other hand, when peace has been signed there is no room for special alliances or covenants within the League or for any action which is not consistent with the common interest of all. If democracy is to be made safe, it is a necessary consequence, that all Treaties must be known in their entirety, and if causes of animosity are to be removed it would be inconsistent either to have selfish economic combinations within the League or to allow any form of economic boycott, except that wielded by the League itself as a means of discipline.

The more serious difficulty is to reconcile the view of this country with that which has been held in America, not only during this war, but since the era of her independence, on "the Freedom of the Seas." This should, however, constitute no obstacle to hearty co-operation with America and to hearty support of President Wilson. I think that the possibility of disagreement has been unduly magnified and that there has not been appreciation of the close association between the question of the "Freedom of the Seas" and the principle of a League of Nations. In the later stages of the war America co-operated with this country to maintain the industrial isolation of the Central Powers which had so decisive an influence in bringing the war to an end. Should the occasion of an European war occur at any future time there is no reason to suppose that the action supported by America in this war would be disapproved. It is a different matter that without the active co-operation of America, as a belligerent power, it could not be made so complete and effective. This is only what happened during the earlier stages of the war when America occupied the position of a neutral. It may be remembered that the main object of American jurists has been the protection of neutral commerce, a commerce which will not need protection in the case of countries who are constituent members of the League of Nations. It is moreover the direct object of a League of Nations to prevent the recurrence of a great war between rival allied powers, and for this purpose to use all effective forms of international sanction, even that of force in the last resort. If this system is found to be effective this country would not require to exercise its belligerent rights to the detriment of the industry of neutrals, but would take its part in enforcing an international settlement and in aiding to establish an international blockade against

the offending country. If an international blockade is to be sanctioned for this purpose, it is recognised as not wrong in itself, and its effectiveness has been amply demonstrated during the war. In other words, the usual rights which this country claims to exercise in war time would not be required to come into operation so long as an effective League of Nations is operative. On the other hand, if the League ceased to be operative, or if its operation was found not to be effective, then the basis, on which the suggested surrender of belligerent naval rights has been supported, would be undermined, and this country could not be expected to assent to any proposal which under the special conditions of her position as an island centre and a world-wide Empire, would render her naval superiority less effective in the event of some future European war. The expression "Freedom of the Seas" lends itself to misunderstanding. It has reference to a different interpretation in the rules of international law during a period of warfare, and does not in any way affect peace conditions. It does not imply any measure of naval disarmament or restriction in the number of ships or seamen. It may be that some measure of relative disarmament may follow as a term of Peace conditions; but such disarmament would be a matter of general policy and not dependent on the principle involved in "The Freedom of the Seas."

There is no reason to suggest that the omens are not favourable for the constitution of an effective League of Nations. It is a good sign that Lord Robert Cecil has been appointed to attend the Peace Conference with special reference to this question. There is a wide general recognition that, apart from a League of Nations, there is no guarantee of permanency of peace, no safeguard against the outbreak of a fresh European war, to be carried on with still more brutal weapons of destruction, and likely to lead to such a measure of disaster as will threaten the whole fabric of Christian civilisation. Other civilisations—notably those of Greece and Rome—have perished under the strain of repeated warfare. If the Christian civilisation is to survive, it must hold fast to the principle of a League based on impartial justice and on the conception of a common brotherhood as distinguished from a reign of force, nurtured by a desire to inflict either humiliation or revenge. The ruin of Greek civilisation consequent on the Peloponnesian war may not indirectly be traced to the want of any moral guidance which would merge the State animosities in the higher principles of an overruling humanity.

If the general principle is conceded, there are no insuperable difficulties in constituting at the Peace Conference an International Council which would at least impose an obligation of delay, and which, apart from other forms of sanction, could rely on the strong support of general public opinion. I believe that a period of delay, and an opportunity for the expression of public opinion, would have prevented the outbreak in 1914; but it must not be forgotten that the alliances, on which either party relied, could not have existed with a League of Nations, and that the sinister treaties of insurance and reinsurance would not be consistent with a public disclosure of all treaties in their entirety, so that the peoples, as well as the Governments, may know what is the standard or extent of their international engagements. If the sanction of public opinion is not found

to be sufficient, it could be supplemented by the force of economic action and ultimately by the actual coercion of force. I doubt, however, whether this remedy is necessary, and it is practically certain that it would only be required under exceptional conditions. The International Council would not only be a safeguard against war, but would provide a means to regulate the growing requirements of international co-operation, and to remove sources of friction, before they grow into a sense of racial bitterness and animosity. A second tribunal would be required to deal with judicial questions, capable of hearing such disputes as the interpretation of Treaties, and the construction of the principles of International Law. It would not be necessary in the first instance to institute a permanent tribunal if it is difficult to find agreement as to the nature of its constitution. It would be sufficient that an obligation should be instituted in the Peace settlement bringing all the constituent countries under a duty to submit such disputes to an Arbitration tribunal, chosen by the parties between whom the dispute has arisen, subject to the approval of the International Council. I recognise that a body of international Common Law cannot be framed without a period of trial and the weight of precedent, and that it is a mistake to attempt too much in the first instance; but the aim should be to build up a rule of international law which in time may give the same security in international disputes as is now given within the boundaries of civilised states. There was much discussion when the disputes which arose between this country and America, in connection with the "Alabama," were submitted to arbitration. The award was given against this country, but no action in modern times has done more to create and maintain the spirit of goodwill which has been so potent a factor in the victory over Germany. It is said that a League of Nations, constituted on the above lines, would interfere with the independence of Sovereignty; but no League which does not in some degree interfere with the independence of Sovereignty would be of any value, and it is in order to place some measure of restraint on this independence that the whole principle of a new order in international co-operation is founded. It is against the use of its Sovereignty by Germany for the purposes of violent aggression that nearly the whole civilised world has entered so vigorous a protest. Disarmament would naturally follow the constitution of an effective League of Nations, not only on the ground that to continue huge armaments would then become a useless expenditure, but also that a League of Nations is based on the substitution of justice for force, and on the restitution of science to its true purposes of improving our control of the forces of Nature, for the benefit and assistance of mankind.

The conclusion, however, of the whole matter depends on the spirit in which the peace settlement is arranged; and national honour as well as national gratitude should impel us to support in every possible manner the efforts of President Wilson, and to realise that in no other way can we ensure a permanent peace, founded on an impartial justice applied without discrimination both to belligerent and ally, both to the vanquished and the victorious.

PARMOOR.

THE REPARTITION OF AFRICA.

IN view of the many complex and urgent problems that must engage the consideration of the impending Peace Conference, the fact that decisions of the most vital importance for the peoples of Africa will have to be taken is not likely to appeal to more than comparatively few persons of influence qualified to guide them in the most far-sighted manner.

But the occasion is acutely critical: for the Peace Settlement will have to deal with the future of what were the German Colonies—namely Togoland, the Cameroons, South-West Africa and East Africa—and it is extremely important that thoroughly well-considered conditions should be attached to whatever assignment of their sovereignty may be made.

It has been announced that the British Government will not consent to the restitution of any African Colonies to Germany, and that, with regard to all of them, they will give their whole support to the claims of the Dominions. What the claims of the Union Government in regard to Africa are likely to be, is not yet disclosed.

From the moment that Germany was defeated in these territories, most Englishmen acquainted with African affairs have considered it obvious, for reasons quite independent of the military considerations referred to recently by Mr. Balfour, that it would be impossible to return them to her. But what will be urged in this paper would apply equally to the situation even if any were to be so dealt with.

The world has in any case now to deal with a large revision of the Partition of Africa—a Re-partition in which it may moreover very likely be found convenient to readjust some of the boundaries of territories already under the sovereignty of non-German Powers.

In this Re-partition, the following principal factors will have influence:—

(1) The diplomatic claims of the Governments associated with our own in the military conquests, namely, France in Togoland and the Cameroons, the Union of South Africa, and, in some slight degree, Portugal in South-West Africa, the Union of South Africa, Portugal and Belgium in East Africa. And, in respect of all these, the claims of our own Government and the attitude of the United States of America. Italian claims will not, I imagine, much affect the Settlement, nor those of Spain.

(2) The ascertainable desires, preferences and interests of the native inhabitants. To speak of "self-determination" in connection with these aggregates, appears to me to be empty and ill-informed phrase-making. The "self-determination" of native peoples, exercised through their chiefs in the past, has often been a destructive agency that white Government has had to control for their benefit.

(3) The adjusted comparative pulls of commercial interests, of which the British Empire Producers' Association may be, without prejudice, referred to as an example.

(4) Disinterested and instructed Humanitarianism, or, as I might call it, "Scientific Africanism," which regards the permeation of African native territories and their subordination, in existing world conditions, to European control as a process absolutely justifiable in the interests of all parties concerned and indispensable for the progress of world-prosperity; *but* justifiable only if it is advanced

and controlled with strict and consistent regard to the human and economic rights of the native peoples.

Now I think it must be recognised that, under present conditions, factors (1) and (3)—the diplomatic and the commercial—are and will be much more powerful, active, vocal and influential than factors (2) and (4), the desires of the natives, and the principles of scientific Africanism. The fact that they have been so in the past is the standing disgrace of European relations with Africa; and, however indignant we may now be professing ourselves over Germany's record, there is truly no other Power in a position to cast the first stone at her, as having itself an entirely unstained record. The truth is, right conduct in such relations does not come by nature; and we ourselves, who claim to set a good example, had been at school for centuries in tropical colonial administration before Germany tried her prentice fist on African man. The class of those who stand, as I hope I rightly believe the British Colonial Office and as certainly most of its best known administrators do, for what I have called Scientific Africanism is a small one; and, small as it is amongst ourselves, it is still less representative and influential in the public opinion of the other Colonial Powers with whom we have to agree in the Peace Settlement. It appears likely that the United States of America, which at present exercises no sovereignty in Africa, and has no administrative experience there except through its connection with the Republic of Liberia, which has not been a very successful experiment, will be our strongest, if not our only really whole-hearted Ally. It is, therefore, of urgent importance that on behalf of the native populations the demand should be formulated and pressed, in whatever manner it can most effectually be brought to bear, that in the Peace Settlement there shall be provided for not merely a re-distribution of sovereignty over the German colonies, but a tabling of the whole question of the principles to be adhered to by European sovereignties as a condition of their exercising rule over African peoples at all.

Mr. Balfour, in stating recently that Germany's former colonies could not be returned to her, laid it down also that British Imperialism does not aim at the oppression or exploitation of subject peoples. This was a very acceptable declaration, and so far as such of our leading statesmen as Mr. Balfour and Lord Milner are concerned, quite unimpeachable. But it seems to some people to raise an uncomfortable doubt whether Mr. Balfour fully recognised what it implied, or whether this right-hand British Imperialism knows what the left hand is doing.

When an external Power annexes an African territory, it may, without incurring any imputation of a desire to "exploit" the natives, impose customs duties, whether on imports or on exports, for the purpose of raising public revenue to defray the expenses of government, intended and recognised to be beneficial to them. And this, hitherto, has usually been the policy of British trading colonies. But if the annexing Power imposes a differential duty favouring its own imports or those of its Dominions or Allies, or, as was recently proposed in some British West African Colonies, an export duty to fall only on produce sold to other nations, it does "exploit" the natives by taxing them for the exclusive profit of its own importers and exporters. For the importer is enabled to demand from the

natives who buy his goods a price exceeding the open market price and increasing his own profit by approximately the amount of the differential duty (which is not received for the benefit of the natives as Revenue), and the exporter is enabled to buy the natives' produce at a price falling short of the open market price, and increasing his own profit by approximately the amount of the special export duty (which also is not received for public use as Revenue). Now the Government of which Mr. Balfour is a member has announced that its policy is Imperial Preference; that is, that it "aims at" differential Colonial Tariffs, and it is understood that it would be prepared to sanction in West Africa a differential export duty on palm kernels and other oil nuts. And this line of policy is advocated by many who consider themselves the most orthodox of Imperialists, as a legitimate policy for the advantage of the British producer and manufacturer. They see nothing in this degree of exploitation to apologise for, or, as Mr. Balfour did, to disclaim on behalf of the Empire.

Those who, having assumed through annexation and Custom Houses control of the trade of an African territory, impose a preferential tariff, either on imports or on exports, in favour of their own trade, or in favour of Allied trade against Germany, are, though they may not realise it, aiming at enriching their own traders at the direct expense of the subjected natives. They may, no doubt, argue policy and justification, on the ground that their own country must command these markets or these supplies of raw materials; or that it is not good for the natives to be able to earn money too easily; but these are not answers to Mr. Balfour. It is extremely desirable that such elementary truths should be clearly realised by all who may have anything to do with the settlement of the future of the German colonies, or of the policy of a League of Nations.

The fundamental question, on the answer to which determination of policy for tropical dependencies must rest, is this—What is the purpose, motive or justification of the assumption and exercise of sovereignty in these territories by European Powers?

The motives of Imperial expansion are either economic or (what I must call, though I dislike the word) Humanitarian. The economic motive has always immensely preponderated, but the humanitarian impulse has also had positive influence and practical effect, greater or less in different phases of colonial history. It is implied in the name "Protectorate" of one of the varieties of Colonial Government in fact now embracing its largest sphere of operation; and it tends to find more and more outspoken recognition and effect in the proceedings of international conclaves such as those which produced the Berlin Act and the Brussels Convention. Its recognition is essentially implied in the ideas out of which the purpose of establishing a League of Nations arises, and which were announced by the King, in dissolving Parliament, as the principles that were to be enthroned for the future in our dealings with other peoples. "Righteousness and justice" in colonisation postulate the recognition of the human rights of the natives. Colonisation inspired solely by the economic motive has too often entirely ignored them. Advance from the mere following of elementary economic motives to a policy in which the humanitarian motives are recognised and have equal weight is the most important characteristic of progress in colonial policy in Tropical Dependencies.

Simplifying and summarising to the utmost, the modes of Imperial expansion resulting from economic motives may be thus classified:

(1) Residential settlement—actual migration of surplus population for subsistence—resting usually on cattle and agriculture, and developing in “white men’s countries” into true permanent colonisation.

(2) Trading settlement—in its elementary phases limited to the occupation of suitable depots on coasts, and the planting of subsidiary trading stations and factories on the navigable rivers or old established trade-routes.

These are the two leading elementary types of tropical colonisation.

(1) necessarily involves annexation and territorial government to which the native inhabitants are subjected.

(2) has not, in the earlier stages of the history of colonisation, involved more than the annexation and administration of limited *enclaves* and the establishment of Custom Houses and protective forces.

Before passing to secondary and more complex types of colonisation, it must be noted that in Africa these purely economic developments have *always* at first produced oppression and exploitation which, in turn, have given rise to reactions of the humanitarian conscience.

(1) Settlement produced (as it has done in all ages and all countries)—

Firstly, slavery, praedial and domestic, and the humanitarian reaction against it.

Secondly, compulsory, or indentured labour, with corresponding reactions against the evils of these, reactions not as yet wholly effective.

Thirdly, the expropriation of the natives from land or the appropriation of their cattle or other means of subsistence, in order to compel them to work for wages on estates—with the corresponding reactions, still somewhat less effective.

Fourthly, pressure on natives to labour for wages through direct or indirect taxation, which is still a very widely approved or countenanced colonial policy, actively operated in British Dominions.

(2) Trading Colonisation encouraged—

Firstly, the old slave trade for the supply of the planting colonies, with the humanitarian reaction which suppressed it.

Secondly, internal slave-driving (for caravan porters) in the hinterlands, and internal plundering for purposes of trade. These operations, besides domestic slave raiding and trading, were very actively rife in wide regions of Africa long after the export of slaves had been put down; and there was little effectual reaction against them until new factors in colonial development arose.

Thirdly, the importation and sale, often against the wishes of native tribal chiefs, of merchandise destructive to the native populations, especially spirits, rifles and ammunition. Here, also, the humanitarian and missionary reaction against these evils had to await new movements in colonisation before it attained much effect. The liquor trade still holds its own very stoutly.

Fourthly, Exploitation by trading monopolies or preferential import or export duties.

The secondary and more complex types of colonisation arose through the new economic stimuli of—

(3) Mineral discoveries of gold and other valuable metals, diamonds, coal and petroleum.

(4) Recognition of rubber, timber, and other new forestal resources, together with the development of new methods of enterprise in the tapping of supplies of cotton, cocoa, and other plantation produce, to be grown, not by white settlers and planters, but by natives, under the direction and encouragement of the Government, and of trading companies.

It was the glamour of these latter possibilities, together with increasing appreciation of the value of the older forms of African trade, especially in oils, and the adoption by Germany of projects of true colonisation by settlement as an outlet for her surplus population, that caused the scramble for Africa and precipitated its partition. They produced, first, a competition of concession-hunters whose dealings with the native chiefs, and the claims to land and the quarrels which arose thereout, necessitated intervention by the Powers whose subjects they were. *Protectorates* and *Spheres of influence* were added to the forms of colonial polities. Chartered trading and development companies, whose operations it was supposed could be controlled from the standpoint of humanitarianism, were granted special privileges in particular areas.

Further, the demand for mining labour produced a whole series of new developments in which economic demand came into conflict with humanitarian or political principle. In the Congo and the Portuguese possessions new varieties of slave driving were invented; Germany took in hand the breaking in of the natives of her new annexations according to her own prescriptions, at the same time applying the screw of expropriation to compel praedial labour. Reaction from the humane point of view was slower and less acute than it might have been elsewhere; there was, however, some of such reaction on the part of the German Socialists and Clericals, and an economic reaction was also provoked by the destruction of labour force.

This extension of contact between European power and trade and internal tropical Africa accentuated and made more effectual the reactions against the internal slave trade and slavery, the liquor trade, and the sale of arms and ammunition to natives.

The purely humane motive in colonial policy had quite early in the period of the Partition of Africa, already so far advanced that certain extensions of sovereignty (as over Basutoland and Bechuanaland) were actually undertaken under that impulse. This was largely due to the influence of missionaries, and had the urgings of missionaries and the desires of native chiefs had their way, there would have been a great deal more of this class of colonisation than there actually has been, and never any German colonies on the West side of Africa. A phenomenon of similar significance was the demand made by the British and American delegates at the Berlin Congress of 1885, that humanitarian principles should be observed in dealings with natives in territories to be annexed by European Powers.

Now the science of the humane government of tropical dependencies has made great advances through the experiences of practical administration in the 35 years that have passed since the scramble for Africa.

The principles laid down in the Berlin and Brussels Congresses embodied, for the Nations, equal rights of navigation on great inland waterways and equal rights of trade without subjection to differential duties, and, for the natives, prohibition of slavery, slave trading, liquor traffic, military weapons and ammunition, together with a positive undertaking on the part of the Nations "to watch over the preservation of the native races and the amelioration of the moral and material conditions of their existence, and to protect and encourage all religious, scientific or charitable institutions established for these objects, or tending to educate the natives in the advantages of civilisation." Such provisions in these terms are obviously now much too vague. Our experience of the administrative resultant of the interactions of the economic and the humanitarian demands would enable a council of experienced Colonial Administrators to formulate a much fuller and more complete code than could be propounded in 1885, with as good a chance of concerted acceptance as the vague humanitarian generalisations that were imported into the proceedings of the Berlin Congress.

For example, with regard to the evils which I have referred to as arising from economic exploitations—not only would agricultural or domestic slavery be forbidden to the white employer, but the conditions of contract or wage employment would be subjected to restrictions and control under a precise code adopted by the African Council of the League. Forced labour, under the authority of tribal chiefs, is a permissible institution for the execution of public services—as in the old *brig-bote* and *burg-bote* of our own ancestors. It can only gradually be superseded by rates and taxes. But its abuse to provide labour for private profit can be guarded against by regulations for the framing of which there is now ample material of experience.

The rights of natives in land would be settled and defined, and provision made for maintaining them. The policy of forcing natives into wage employment, whether by taking away their own means of livelihood or by pressure of taxation would be guarded against. The administrative policy of raising revenue and endeavouring to provide development by making large land concessions to Companies, thereby establishing monopolies which in the future are bound to become very onerous to the community, would demand very careful restriction. The principle of effective occupation should be applied to them, as it was, by the Berlin Act, to annexation of territory by European Powers.

The complete separation of administration from exploitation would be insisted on. Maintenance of and respect for tribal authority, law and custom, as far as possible, would be guaranteed. Distilled liquor would be excluded, and its manufacture prohibited. If the principle attributed to British Imperialism by Mr. Balfour—and which surely must be that of a League of Nations—is to be adhered to, the fiscal policy of Tropical Dependencies must be Free Trade and the general economic policy of the Open Door, without differentiation in tariffs or rates for transportation by rail or river.

A great deal of what is being written and talked about German

Colonies appears to be based on the assumption that such territories are an immediately desirable and valuable property to the nation which is their sovereign, and that the transfer of such property to the conqueror of Germany will be a rich booty. It is often forgotten that the assumption of responsibility for the Government of such territories demands considerable out-of-pocket expense. In former times it has involved large military expenditure, and the maintenance of semi-military police forces. It may still do so before internal law and order can be established. If this were not the case we should have long ago enlarged our own Colonial Empire much more rapidly than we did. Effective occupation, and the capacity to enforce the law of the sovereign power are a recognised condition of the right to assert sovereignty. Not only are grants of money out of the National Exchequer and drafts of suitable white men for the Public Service required—and this material is expensive to maintain, and was even before the war not over-abundant in qualified supply—but nothing can be done in such territories without railways, river transport, and motor roads; and there are only two modes of providing the capital for them, viz.: either from grants from or loans on the credit of the Imperial Government which will not for some time pay interest, or by the introduction of private capital, to secure which the future development of the territory has to be subjected to monopolies, either of trading rights or of land settlement.

If the policy of the open door is unreservedly applied it may be cheaper for a commercial nation to trade in other nations' colonies than to go into administration itself. This consideration is often appealed to as a reason for a policy of monopoly and exclusion; and, if colonisation is to be regarded as a power undertaken solely for the profit of home manufacturers, there is a limited force in it. For example, France can cogently urge that if the cotton manufacturers of Lille and Roubaix are not protected in their colonies they can not regain their trade against British or German competition. But from the point of view of the native population and of the Revenues of the local Government, it is obvious that the additional trade encouraged by the open door is a valuable advantage to the territory. From the point of view of the home taxpayer, in so far as the Imperial Government have to finance new Protectorates, from his point of view as a consumer interested in tropical raw materials, and from all points of view for the native, the open door is the most advantageous policy. Monopoly, Protection, and Preference benefit only a limited section of home manufacturers.

All those interested in the future of Africa should demand and do their best to secure that no territory shall be placed under new European Sovereignty in the impending repartition except under very distinct conditions, laid down in explicit code. Such a principle would appear to involve as a necessary corollary that no new territory in Africa ought to be brought under any new sovereignty unless that sovereignty undertakes to apply in the territories it already has the same code of conditions. What those who are interested in Africa from the point of view of Scientific Africanism desire is that no final commitments should be made in the Peace Settlement with regard to the repartition except subject to the considered recommendations of a special Conference, Congress, or Chamber, sitting

subsidiarily to the organisation of a League of Nations, to deal specially and comprehensively with the principles to be adhered to by all parties to the Congress, or members of the League, in questions of African administration. They desire that what was attempted very shadowily in the Berlin Act and the Brussels Convention, in the direction of establishing a code, should be taken up and carried as far as possible further forward, and that an attempt should be made to devise means, under the sanction of international authority, to ensure that that code shall not only be applied to new ground, or in territory dealt with under the Peace Settlement, but shall also be given reactive effect in all African territories where native populations are held in subordination or tutelage. They desire that such African populations shall be recognised as just as fully entitled as Europeans to be regarded as Nations, but that, on account of their existing disabilities and political and industrial immaturity, they should be represented as minors by trustees, the trustees being the Sovereign Governments, answerable to the Court of the League of Nations as Trustees are to our Court of Chancery. The Conference or Committee which is to advise as to the lines on which the repartition is to be finally settled would necessarily include representatives having actual experience of Protectorate administration, direct representatives of Native feeling and interests, and representatives of commercial and developmental interests. Many years ago, before 1885, one of our most successful African administrators, Sir F. Lugard, urged the establishment of such a joint African Council. Once constituted it should be permanent, as a Chamber of the Society of Nations, and progressively amend and extend its code of African policy.

SYDNEY OLIVIER.

INDIAN CONSTITUTIONAL REFORMS.

IT is impossible to discuss fully in one article the Report on Indian Constitutional Reforms submitted to the public for criticism by the Secretary of State and the Viceroy of India. The Report consists of three hundred octavo pages, and is full of matter of the deepest interest, about a good deal of which there is no doubt some difference of opinion. I shall confine myself mainly to one subject, viz.: the Extension of Self-Government to the Provinces.

On the 20th August, 1917, the Secretary of State for India made the following announcement in the House of Commons: "The policy of His Majesty's Government with which the Government of India are in complete accord, is that of the increasing association of Indians in every branch of the administration and the gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to the progressive realisation of responsible government in India as an integral part of the British Empire. They have decided that substantial steps in this direction should be taken as soon as possible, and that it is of the highest importance as a preliminary to considering what these steps should be, that there should be a free and informal exchange of opinion between those in authority at home and in India." Mr. Montagu then announced his intention to visit India on the invitation of the Viceroy, and continued: "I would add that progress in this policy can only be achieved by successive stages, the British Government and the Government of India, on whom the responsibility lies for the welfare and advancement of the Indian peoples, must be judges of the time and measure of each advance; and they must be guided by the co-operation received from those upon whom new opportunities of service will thus be conferred, and by the extent to which it is found that confidence can be reposed in their sense of responsibility."

This quotation is important as laying down clearly certain matters which have, to a large extent, been lost sight of in much of the criticism of the Montagu Chelmsford Report. First of all, it will be observed that in the declaration of the policy of His Majesty's Government the Secretary of State refers to two matters which, it ought not to be very necessary to point out, are entirely distinct from one another, though they may, to a certain extent, be brought into close association: viz., (1) The increasing association of Indians in every branch of the administration, and (2) The gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to the progressive realisation of responsible government in India as an integral part of the British Empire.

In the second place, there is an important statement that substantial steps in this direction should be taken as soon as possible. In much of the criticism of the Report, it is forgotten that this implied promise has been made. As Lord Curzon said in the House of Lords, "This promise committed us, Parliament and the Nation. I cannot recall any suggestion of dissent either from the spirit or even from the phraseology of that declaration."

This implied pledge cannot be broken without a distinct sense of breach of faith.

In the third place, I should like to point out very clearly that the Secretary of State has paid his promised visit to India, seen the conditions on the spot, and faced the difficulties. The Report therefore has provided for a cautious development of this policy. It is only to be achieved by successive stages. There is no doubt in Mr. Montagu's mind, and there is left no doubt in the declaration of the policy, that the responsibility for the welfare of the Indian peoples rests on the British Government and the Government of India. They are responsible for the welfare not of a mere section of the people but of all classes; and this responsibility lays on them the necessity to judge the time and the measure of each advance. Closely connected with this is another very important statement, viz.: that the time and measure of each advance will be greatly determined by the amount of co-operation which the Government receives from those to whom the extension of this policy gives opportunities of service to their fellow-countrymen and to the State, and by the extent to which these persons prove their title to the confidence of the Government in their sense of responsibility.

It is worth while thus carefully to examine this declaration of August, 1917, because it forms the basis of the Montagu Chelmsford proposals, and because it has been very largely neglected, misinterpreted or misunderstood, in the criticisms of the Report. We have, for example, a pamphlet entitled, "The Proposed Constitutional Reforms in India and what they mean," by the Indo-British Association. After some little criticism, part of which seems to me quite reasonable and part unreasonable, the pamphlet closes by "substituting for destructive criticism" an outline of "the reforms which it advocates." These are divided into seven paragraphs. Six of these are practically taken from the Report, viz.: to readjust the responsibilities of the Secretary of State in Council and the Viceroy in Council; to reconstruct the Indian Office; to confer a full authority upon provincial governments in all their domestic affairs; to reconstruct the electorate of the provincial legislative councils on a broader basis; to transfer all municipal and local government to elected bodies; and to press forward elementary education.

The seventh paragraph is the only one in which anything new is proposed. The proposal is this: "In every province place one or two districts wholly under the Indian members of the different services. If after a period of trial the system is proved to work well, other districts may be similarly staffed. Later a Commissioner's division can be so handed over; and the process, if shown to be successful, can be continued until the whole province comes under Indian rule in the future." The Indo-British Association, we are told, is convinced that by this geographical method of handing over to Indians the administration in defined areas "effective powers can be gradually and safely transferred to Indian hands, without dislocating the existing machinery, creating interminable friction and undermining in all India the only authority which holds the heterogeneous mass together and stands between them and such anarchy as now prevails in Russia."

Here we have a very excellent illustration of the absolute failure to understand or sympathise with the second part of the policy declared in August, 1917. This proposal is merely to increase the association of Indians in the administration. That is a thing that has been steadily going on since Her Majesty Queen Victoria's great Proclamation assuming the charge of the Indian Empire on behalf of the British Government. When I went to India 47 years ago, the highest executive appointment held by an Indian was that of Assistant Magistrate. When I was Lieutenant Governor of Bengal, just over ten years ago, a member of the Board of Revenue, that is to say of the next authority to the Lieutenant Governor in the Executive line, was an Indian who afterwards served on the Council of the Secretary of State in London. There were Indians serving as Commissioners and District Magistrates. And, since I left India, ten years ago, Indians have been appointed to the Executive Councils both of the Viceroy and of the Governors of Provinces. All these have been selected carefully, because they were judged fit for their appointments, and because it had been distinctly laid down that race was to be no disqualification. The application of that principle is beyond the stage of experiment: we can find Indians fit for any executive office.

What is now proposed by the Indo-British Association is to carry forward that principle in a larger degree in certain selected areas. They propose to separate off certain districts and say that they shall be officered by Indian officers. Is it wise or necessary that Indian officers and British officers should thus be kept completely apart? I can quite easily see grave disadvantages in such an arrangement. But suppose this proposal were thoroughly sound, it does not affect the question of giving the people a share in the self-government of the country. It would merely be a placing of Indians, instead of Europeans, in office under the same benevolent autocracy or bureaucracy. This increasing appointment of Indian officers is undoubtedly desirable for many reasons. It is a subject which demands attention, and which receives attention in this Report. But it is not the same question at all as the gradual development of self-governing institutions and the progressive realisation of responsible government in India.

It is to this matter of self-government that I wish to give special attention. This is the new thing in the Report. The claim is put forward that in announcing the determination to proceed with it, "the British Government adopted a new policy towards three hundred millions of people." In a sense the policy is not new. The Report acknowledges the fact that this idea has existed in the minds of some of the best past rulers of India, who have held it before them as the ultimate aim of our endeavours to educate and elevate the peoples of the country. They also recognise fully the generous policy which has been pursued in the training of Indians by placing them alongside of their European fellow subjects in office under the Crown. This policy has been, as already indicated, steadily pursued with a great measure of success. They also appreciate the aim of Lord Ripon's Government in their introduction of a system of Local Self-Government and the thoroughly suitable character of the training which Local Self-Government gives in political and administrative work. They also trace very clearly the outcome of all this, in that capacity for administration which has led to the development

of the legislative councils. The sections of the Report that deal with all these are of the very highest interest.

These sections tend to show that this new thing now introduced is in a very important sense merely the development of past policy. Nevertheless, the present proposal is new, for it is intended to give self-government in provincial matters and a sense of responsibility for the administration of the country. There are two features of it which may be regarded as new. The first is that the policy is deliberately adopted as the policy of Government which is systematically to be pressed. The second is that the policy gives new power and responsibility to the non-official or elected part of the Provincial Councils.

The first of these features is of great importance. It is often said by the critics of this scheme that the experiment in Local Self-Government which has been made since Lord Ripon's time, has been not very successful. I am not prepared to admit this. I know places where it has been a great success; and I am confident that, where it has failed, the failure has been due mainly to neglect or merely spasmodic effort on the part of the officers of the Government. I admit that, for earnest men who realise their responsibility for getting the work of a province or even a district done effectively and smoothly, it is very difficult to hand over part of that work to other people, especially if these are, to a certain extent, untried and require a good deal of guidance. I remember on one occasion, soon after I went to Bengal as Lieutenant Governor, I had a talk with a man who was perhaps the most influential and the most wealthy of the Zamindars of that province as then constituted. We were discussing the matter of the District Councils in the districts where his estates were situated. I endeavoured to persuade him to take a greater interest in the work of the District Council and to become a member. He declined on the ground of his dignity and of pressure of work. I pointed out to him that he would be responsible if things went wrong in his estates. His answer was given with an easy smile—"Not at all. I know perfectly well that the District Magistrate or the Government will not allow things to go wrong. If the Council does not do the work properly, it will be immediately superseded and the work will be done by the officers of Government." This was no system under which to give men a sense of responsibility or to train them in self-government. What was wanted was to have the officers of Government alongside of the people all the time, influencing them and pressing them to do the work for themselves, as they were perfectly competent to do, giving them advice in a friendly way when they wanted it, and always enabling them to understand that they had the sympathy and the support of the officers with whom it was their great pleasure to live on the best of terms. That was done in certain provinces; and in these provinces local self-government was a great success.

In this connection I may also say that here we have a hint as to the solution of the difficulty in regard to an electorate. When the district officer and his subordinates and also, for the matter of that, his superiors, as they go about the district in camp, make the people understand that the work that they have most interest in is to be done by the members that they select for the Local Board or District Council, they will realise the importance of selecting a suitable candidate. And if, when the interests of a village, for

example, are found to be neglected, the district officer takes the trouble to bring the member of the Local Board and the head man of the village face to face, he teaches both of them their mutual relations and their mutual responsibilities. There are districts in the Central Provinces where I could easily have found a perfectly sound electorate fit to choose a suitable representative of the agricultural interests. And I do not believe that things have altered in that respect since.

Then the second feature of the new scheme, as contrasted with what has gone before, is this: That the members of council elected under the new scheme will have everywhere a certain degree of responsibility, which will be the greater or the less according as they are found capable of dealing with more or fewer of the departments of administration. Hitherto non-official members of the Council have been summoned, ostensibly for the purpose of advising the Government, really with the result of criticising it. Government desired to have the advice of Indians on Indian questions—a most proper and worthy desire. But no responsibility for the carrying out of their views was ever given to these advisers, and they were simply irresponsible critics. There have been many advantages in the system which has been carried out so far. One of these is that people have learned the system of election for membership of council; and some more or less satisfactory electorates have already been formed. This fact ought not to be lost sight of in considering the question of the franchise in the new system. The advantage of the old system was real. But there has been at least one great disadvantage. That is, that the energy of the Councillors has been really devoted to criticism. Irresponsible criticism is no means of training men in the doing of real work; and it is, after all, of very questionable advantage even to the Government itself. Therefore it is that this new development has been proved to be necessary.

In proposing this new system, from what has been already said it will be clearly seen that the Report recognises the principle that we govern India in the interests not of one class, but of all. Any criticism of the Report which does not acknowledge this, seems to me absolutely unjust. At the same time, there are principles of liberty and self-government which are held by the vast majority of the educated classes, and which we cannot ignore. They are due to our educational system, to our past policy, and to the effect on educated Indians of the principles enunciated by our great leaders in respect of the world-war. They are also contained in the implied promise of August, 1917. Therefore, "substantial steps" must be taken in furtherance of the policy therein set forth. On the other hand, while this is true, the progress must be cautious. The Report is clear on our responsibility to do nothing injurious to the vital interests of the peoples and Empire of India and on the great difficulties which stand in the way of progress. These difficulties lie in the necessity for preventing vital mistakes and also in the necessity for securing as far as possible adequate representation of all interests. While caution is necessary, however, progress must be firmly and systematically insisted on. Spasmodic effort has tended to failure in the past; and the proposals of this Report for Parliamentary Commissions periodically to examine the work, the progress

made, and the possibility of further developments, seem to me to be undoubtedly required.

It is proposed for the present, that is until the period of training is over and capacity for self-government is fully proved to the satisfaction of the Government of India and of Parliament, to retain the supremacy of the Government of India and to leave the final authority in respect of administration in the hands of those who are responsible to the Secretary of State as representing the British Government and Parliament. It is also proposed to retain under the executive government in each province, certain vital subjects, such as affect, for instance, peace or order, and also such subjects as affect the masses for which no system of adequate representation is at present possible. It is proposed to select certain departments of administration in which the electorate are interested and which they are likely to administer well, and to transfer them from the executive government to popular control. These are called "Transferred Subjects," and will be administered by ministers chosen by the Governor from the elected members of Council and responsible to the Council.

I need not go into the details of the system whereby these two classes of subjects (reserved and transferred) are to be administered. But I think that I may say that, though I see certain disadvantages in even appearing to divide the Provincial Government into two parts, I see no better way of giving the non-official members the necessary share of responsibility in the administration. It may be that, when details are being threshed out in the Indian Provinces by the Special Committees now at work, some modification of the scheme of the Report may be suggested. I am sure that any sound suggestion will be welcomed. The necessity for doing something is recognised, we ought all to aim at doing it in the best possible way.

These two Special Committees are engaged working out details on which the success of the scheme depends, *viz.*, (1) The provision of a satisfactory system of franchise or of selection of the non-official portion of the Provincial Council; (2) A proper selection of "transferred subjects." Lord Southborough has been appointed Chairman of both; because it is intended that they should not only work apart in each province, but also that they should meet together for discussion, inasmuch as there is a clear interdependence between their subjects. Both of them depend largely on the conditions and circumstances of each province. The personnel of the committees has been announced—to me it seems very satisfactory and representative. In each there are two distinguished members of the Civil Service and very representative Indian members; and a very thoroughly competent representative of the European commercial community has been secured for the Franchise Committee. There has been a great deal of criticism of the franchise recommendations of the Report. It has not been observed that it merely indicates conclusions on certain "broad questions." The terms of the reference to the Committee are all of a very wide character; and it will, no doubt, be a great satisfaction to many critics to find how wide is the discretion left to the men with thorough local knowledge, who are making their enquiries in India. Until the reports of these Committees are submitted, it is impossible to come to a final opinion in regard to all the details of the scheme which is now under considera-

tion; but at all events one can for the present recognise the excellence of its outlines and the generous spirit in which it is desired to carry it out.

As to the franchise, the system of election is certainly not now unknown in India, but the electorates that exist are inadequate. They must be broadened, and the electors must be trained. For the present, existing electorates will have to be supplemented by the adoption of temporary expedients which will provide for the representation of interests which the electorates do not represent. I see no insuperable difficulty in finding a combination of electorates and selection by nomination which will provide a representative body quite fit to deal with the "transferred subjects," and so make a real beginning in respect of the policy to which we are pledged. Meanwhile the training of electors is to go on. Primary education is to be pressed, as the great moderate reformers have advocated. Village Panchayats (Councils), in which the self-governing system is found indigenous in India, are to be developed. Local self-government, particularly in the districts, is to be fostered by systematic effort; and the work of the non-official members of Provincial Councils is to be carefully watched and encouraged. Already important orders have been passed regarding education; an excellent resolution has been issued by the Government of India regarding local self-government; bills are before some of the Provincial Councils to establish effective Panchayats in the villages; and the Report provides that Parliamentary Commissions shall periodically deal with the work of the Provincial Councils.

There are only two things more to which I desire to refer. The first is a thought contained in a sentence in the middle of the Report. Its authors say:—"We feel no doubt that in learning to rise to his new responsibilities, the Indian peasant voter will need all the help that other people, officials and non-officials alike, can give him." I thoroughly agree. I would plead for the co-operation of all the influential sections of the community. I would specially plead for that of European non-officials. I hail with delight such a resolution as this, which was passed on 15th October: "The Karachi Chamber of Commerce approve generally of the scheme of constitutional reforms as fulfilling the promise contained in the announcement of the Secretary of State for India of the 20th August, 1917. The scheme might be put into operation, as soon as the war has been won and peace declared." They then go on to helpful criticism and to suggestions for co-operation. If such a spirit prevails among European commercial men, among captains of industry of every race, and among Zamindars and leaders of agricultural life, the success of this measure for the elevation of India is secure. I would also specially emphasise the word "officials." There is not the slightest doubt in my mind, and there is great acknowledgment of it in the Report, that hitherto officials have been the best friends of the people. This is in the very foreground of all the petitions that were presented by all classes and races in India against the proposals of the extremists for the immediate granting of Home Rule. And I believe that the people may well continue to find in the officials of their districts their best friends and advisers. For this thing that it is proposed to do for India, this giving of self-government to the people, is a thing that it is worth running some risks for: it is also worth striving for.

It is worth a great effort on the part of the officers of government. There is no doubt about it that democracy, as we know it, is more an institution of Britain, perhaps, than of any other nation under heaven. We understand it at least as well as any other people. Our officers, therefore, carrying with them the training, traditions and associations of our country, ought to be among the very best teachers of this system to the people. Going about among the people, they ought to endeavour to teach them, in regard to the village Panchayats system, in regard to local self-government, and in regard to the provincial elections, what is the responsibility that is laid on every elector. We used to do this years ago in India. We never fixed upon a man or desired either a person or a party, to succeed; but we endeavoured to teach the people what kind of representatives they ought to have and how best to discharge their own responsibilities. This is a thing that officers of government can do; and it is a thing which the Government of India and the Government of every Province ought to insist on their doing. Let it be understood to be one of the important duties of a district officer—a thing that he must hold before him always in his intercourse with the people—least of all at an election time, but persistently at other times—and I am sure that great progress will very speedily be made.

My last word is to express my astonishment at the criticisms which I have seen, sometimes where I should have expected more just and sober judgment, of a phrase which is used about the middle of the Report. There the writers assert that they are not influenced by the number of persons, whether it be great or small, who really ask for free institutions in India, but they say "Our reason is the faith that is in us." This is interpreted to be a doctrinaire statement of the great gospel of democracy, and of the faith that the authors of the Report have that this gospel is suited to every age and every land and every people. This is an entire perversion of the statement. Let the passage be read, and it will be seen that "the faith that is in them" is that policy in India has step by step been steadily directed to a point at which the question of self-government in India was bound to arise; that this impulse has been encouraged by education and opportunity; that the growth quickened nine years ago was immeasurably accelerated by the war; that the measure of the strength of this growth is not to be found in the crowds at political meetings or in the multiplication of newspapers, but in the infallible signs that indicate the growth of character; that, therefore, the time has come when something of real national life shall be given to the people; and that this Self-Government in India, now adopted as the steadfast policy of the British nation, is a thing that the circumstances in justice demand. I entirely concur. There has been a great development of character in India. I have seen it growing in geometric progression for twenty or thirty years. There are difficulties in the way of satisfactory progress in self-government; and of these the authors of the Report are fully aware; but I do not believe, any more than they, that these difficulties cannot be overcome; and I share the faith by which they profess to be animated.

A. H. L. FRASER.

BARNETT THE SOWER.

“ Fear not to sow because of the birds.”

WHEN I think of Canon Barnett, my memory goes back to my first vision of him in 1885—the long, lofty Oxford Hall, the young, eager, listening faces—the worn, earnest speaker, with a message greater than oratory and an utterance higher than eloquence—himself a speech and a sermon—and the hush that fell on us when, on that soft, sunshiny life of ours, there fell the message from our sunless underworld. To us he was a Peter the Hermit calling to a new crusade. He preached service, not words; help, not gifts; humanity, not dogmas. To that sceptical Oxford of the 'eighties and 'nineties he brought a new breath of faith and life. It was nothing less than a new “Oxford Movement”—a revival of the spirit of early Christianity.

His Church failed to follow or understand. They were shocked by the breadth of his appeal. Like the Pharisees of old, they were angry because he consorted with the publicans. So they refused to make any full use of his great gifts. When they ought to have made him an Archbishop, they made him a Canon. Some of them did their best to drive him, as they drove Wesley, outside their fold. It was only his own great patience, his own splendid humility, that kept him within. But the Church of England missed another of its great chances. God sent them a St. Francis; and because he did not wear the cowl and the cord, they knew him not. The result was in some ways fortunate. His influence, escaping ecclesiastical banks, spread out into wider fields. Once more the children of the world were wiser than the children of light. Those in the court of the Gentiles accepted his simple teaching, and found healing in its wings. Statesmen, Civil Servants, landlords, journalists, workmen—men of all creeds and classes—such were his followers. They have carried his teaching into all fields of practical life. They have deeply influenced Departments, newspapers, and even Governments. They have helped to sweeten and humanise our society—to save us from a war of classes. They have spread the spirit of social service into all ranks. Is it too much to say that at this present crisis the teaching and influence of Barnett is one of the most potent forces of resistance to the rising tide of revolution?

* * * * *

“Prophet” was the name we young men instinctively gave him; but there were many sides of his character—including even an actual genius for foreseeing large social changes and events—which justified that great title. In his always detached outlook on actual politics, his daring denunciation of national faults, his fearless defiance of wickedness in high places, he belonged to that great school which had its first home in Judæa. But he had many other sides to his large and versatile character. He was not always the grave “Prophet.” No one could be happier in sympathetic company; no one could rejoice more heartily with those who rejoiced. He always had a touch of the child in his nature. His laugh was hearty and even uproarious. He loved little innocent jests. Those

Canon Barnett, His Life, Work, and Friends. By His Wife. 2 vols. John Murray. 1918.

who saw him often in the Toynbee Hall days—in his own drawing-room and among his own people—will think of him chiefly as a kindly, genial host, hospitable, considerate, merry-hearted, with a rare mingling of the grave and the gay. Again, there was never a better traveller. Those who, like myself, voyaged with him through Italy or the radiant isles of Greece will always think of him, not as a “prophet,” but as a keen observer and diligent student, always eager to learn, intensely interested in every phase of this wonderful world, eager as a boy for new impressions, delighted with all the simple chances and changes of travel.

Yet he was something more than all this. He was one of those men who drew other men after him. Where lay the secret of that power, so rare, so wonderful when it comes, so soothing and welcome to bewildered mankind? Why was it that to so many differing men, of so many creeds and classes, he could say, “Follow me!” and they followed? This book gives the answer in the form of his life-story. It is wonderful how little we all knew of this. Even to those who saw most of him, much of this story will come as a new revelation. For Barnett talked little of himself. Part of his power lay in his shining self-effacement. Perhaps, indeed, he was little interested in his own achievements. There were times when he would even depreciate his own creations. His mind was so essentially mobile and progressive that he was always travelling ahead of his accomplished tasks. While others had taken sanctuary in his ideas, he had gone forward to pastures new. Thus it was that we who came late on to the scene tended to underrate his earlier work. How conceited he must have found us—how cocksure! But how patiently he endured us—how sympathetically—how tolerantly! How he guided without dictating, and led while seeming to follow!

Walking the pavements of that little Venice which he had built on the social slime of that older Whitechapel—strolling in the fair piazza of the Toynbee Hall Quadrangle—how could we realise the infinite patience and courage that had gone to its upbuilding—the slow driving of the piles on which it now rests—or even that hidden ooze of the mud into which that “master builder” had driven them!

But it was his greatest stroke of good fortune that in his earlier curate days, while still in West London, Barnett had wooed and won a very remarkable and attractive young woman, with a very keen and original outlook on life, and just sufficient difference of brain and heart to give the true salt and savour to their great companionship. It was a “marriage of true minds” if ever there was one—this marriage of the Barnetts—and the whole world seems to be made happier by such partnerships. The families founded by such unions seem to include all humanity. So it was that a woman helped him in his great work, and it is a woman that now tells the story of his life. There are many flashes of colour against that grey background of East London; and Mrs. Barnett, who has a merry and even a boisterous wit, varies her account with many a jolly story. For the cockney always has a cheerful side, even in his worst troubles, and Dickens painted him truly when he gave us his immortal Sam Wellers and Little Dorrits. It is of such that Mrs. Barnett has to tell us, from the old costermonger who would not

drive away the rats from himself at night for fear of waking his wife, to the girl "help" who picked up the baby to throw at her mistress when she was angry with her. In this book, as in Barnett's own life, the sad and the merry are brightly intermingled, like the warp and woof of some splendid fabric.

Mrs. Barnett writes as partner of her husband's work. For hers was often the creative brain. Often to him came the dream; to her the power of making it a reality. Sometimes it was the other way. It was Mrs. Barnett, for instance, to whom the idea came, on a walk in Cornwall, which was the seed of the Children's Holiday Fund movement, while he—with her—attended the committee and worked at the detail until within a few years of his death. But it was she who worked out the plans for Toynbee Hall; while it was to him, as the outcome of their yearly visits to Oxford, that the idea came. In many ways it was a companionship of contrasts. Mrs. Barnett, for instance, has been always essentially a woman of action. She has been ever impatient of delays, intolerant of failure, with the courage of a man added to the insight of a woman. Barnett, on the other hand, had a mystical, Browningsque suspicion of success, a greater love for the idea than for the achievement, a greater vision for character than for ability. How surprised we often used to be at his choice of men! And yet they were always upright men!

Mrs. Barnett suggests an account of their relationship in work in a very pretty idyll from the early days when they rowed on the river at Oxford. "He saw and pointed out where to go, and I knew how to get there." Not perhaps a complete account, but it suggests a detachment which gives her a real advantage as a biographer. Unlike most family biographers, she can see his work from outside. She never presents him to us as one of those images of sugary perfection—"faultily faultless, icily regular, splendidly null"—with which we are so familiar in such literature. She thinks that Barnett was too humble, and she tells us so—though we do not quite agree. She thinks that his judgment was often faulty—as it was. She is of opinion that he suffered fools too gladly—as he did. These criticisms present us with a very human play of contrasting character. But they are only possible and useful because Mrs. Barnett so vividly realises Barnett's true greatness—the pride of moral faith, the fire of moral anger that lay behind that gentle cloak of humility, the strength that gave a background to his tenderness, the underlying aims that were iron girders to his sympathies.

Above all, she too saw the "gleam" which he followed through his life's work. That "gleam" must have seemed sometimes little more than a "will o' the wisp" to the young couple who so humanly and fearfully decided in 1873, on the eve of their marriage, to settle in St. Jude's Vicarage, Whitechapel, and refuse a comfortable living near Oxford. For East London was not an easy adventure in those days, when the Education Acts had scarcely begun to show their power for good, and the London Progressive movement had not yet started on its great sweeping changes.

Six or seven old women formed the only congregation at St. Jude's. The surroundings consisted of a little network of courts and dens, stewing in their own juice of misery and crime. The

people, left to themselves, side-tracked from the centres of London life, were sinking yearly into a deeper degradation and savagery. Barnett's first efforts were met with stones and brickbats. But he worked on with an invincible faith. "Throw down the walls," he cried. From the beginning he made the bold resolve to save the worst by giving them the best, to encourage no compromise in the shape of bad music, bad pictures, and vulgar religion, but to share with them his own spiritual feast—to invite them to his own table. Lookers-on laughed when, instead of "hell fire," in place of the usual menaces and threats of punishment in a world of shadows, he proceeded to present them with the spectacle of goodness and beauty in this life, the heaven that lay within their reach and held his own heart and vision.

It was only gradually that he succeeded. Perhaps he never quite succeeded by the direct appeal of the Church services. There he was too tied and bound by the traditions of the Church. It was only when he was able to go outside and to give them the best music in concert rooms and the best pictures in galleries that the heart of East London was drawn to his message and those dry bones began to live. There were many who said that he resorted to such wider influences because he had failed in direct religious appeal. But that was simply to say that they failed to understand Barnett's life and teaching. Barnett was not one of those men who edge God out of this life and leave to Him only the dregs of the next. God, to him, was everywhere. Goodness to him penetrated everything. It was an affair of this life. For Barnett was what we falsely call "a mystic." He saw God expressing himself daily down here on this earth in multitudinous forms of human conduct and beauty. That was why he spread his net so wide—not because he was less religious than other "persons," but more; not because he despaired of religion, but because religion to him was everywhere, and included everything. Thus gradually he "broke down the walls" of the Church, and interpreted his mission into that of saving and beautifying in every conceivable way. From this central idea there grew, like flowers, many of those movements which are now commonplaces of London life—the Whitechapel Art Gallery, the public libraries, the nature study movement among the London children. Those ideas have grown and spread far, but they began with the lighting of that little torch in Whitechapel. This new spirit of "sweetness and light" in our charity divides our age as with a gulf from that sombre drabness of the old philanthropy which still lingers on in our orphanages and poor-law homes. But in all this Barnett was a pioneer. The commonplaces of our day were the eccentricities of his.

Such pioneering requires great courage. At first his efforts were received by the people with Homeric scorn. When he asked Mrs. Barnett to choose a birthday present in those early days, she chose a policeman to stop the fights. The girls were so wild that the classes often ended in mad scrimmages. His lectures were not attended. But he began to make way. Disciples gradually drifted to Whitechapel to help this heroic pair in their forlorn, desperate struggle at the outposts—gifted women of a type new to this kind of work, men from the West End and from the Universities. For always Barnett beckoned from afar to the young men with great

possessions, pointing to the path of social duty. Men who came once came again. Through the darkness of that social underworld there began—in the 'eighties—to glimmer a new light. Then gradually, emerging from his annual visits to Oxford, there came to Barnett the central idea of his life—the idea which was to be identified with his name throughout the whole world. It was a simple idea. The chief evil of the day being the division of the classes, why not bring them together? That being the aim, how do it more effectively than by bringing together the Universities at one end and the poorest poor of the great cities at the other? Hence the idea of "University Settlement," which had its first beginning at Toynbee Hall, and has since spread through two continents.

The working of that idea in the actual life of Toynbee Hall and other Settlements is familiar to the present generation. Barnett himself would have been the last to claim permanence for that or any other solution of the social trouble. It was a temporary remedy for a temporary evil—the social cleavages of our great cities. He would point to a more enduring idea rather in towns like the Hampstead Garden Suburb, where all classes live simply side by side and share a common life. But as long as our largest towns grow as they still grow—the villas on one side and the mean streets on the other—the University Settlement will survive. It has already had a signal effect on our generation in diminishing the cleavage between the classes.

Barnett believed profoundly in the uses of the Settlement idea as a link between the classes, as a centre of social and educational effort, and as a training ground for the future rulers of the country. He did not encourage men to give all their time to the work; he liked them best to pursue their own callings, although the direction of the Settlement naturally fell into the hands of the "full-timers." He encouraged men to marry and settle in East London. Perhaps, indeed, the Settlement idea was seen in its true fulfilment of function in East London when settlers went out of the Settlement, married, and settled with their families as ordinary citizens. But it is the true condemnation of our social system that such settlers found it, in the East London of that day, extraordinarily difficult to maintain any high standard of family or individual life. Barnett foresaw that, and always warned us against it. The Churches have had the same experience with their clergy. It was essentially at the heart of this Settlement idea that the "Hall" should shine in the midst of a poor neighbourhood as a beacon—a centre, continually fed from without with ideas and light. It is characteristic of our time that the married settlement should now tend to take the place of Barnett's bachelor community, thus bringing in the influence of the woman and the strength of family life.

The present Prime Minister, discussing the Toynbee Hall movement, once expressed to me his strong doubt whether anyone could understand the life of the poor who had not been, like himself, born and bred a poor man. Perhaps. But at any rate the experience of life among the poor may mitigate our misunderstandings. When we consider the sort of comment which classes pass on one another—the coarse, wholesale condemnations—and the fatal results of such talk written in the blaze of revolutions, then we shall do

ill to reject lightly any chance of conciliation. "Comprendre c'est pardonner," said the wise Frenchman. Moving between East and West London in those days, dividing my social life between rich and poor, I was constantly amazed at their ignorance of one another. It is the achievement of men like Barnett that now they understand one another better.

Barnett was "ever a fighter." In his later years honours came to him and some comfort. He had a phase of happy rest at Bristol, where, as Canon, he had the joy of being heartily welcomed by the people of his own native town. But the murmur of the world's unrest drew him eastward again. He could never divide himself from his beloved poor—"God's poor," as the hanny saving is. Even when he took his rest in that beautiful house on the edge of Hampstead Heath—the house with the pines by the side of it—there were always the poor sharing his happiness, old and young, workhouse old ladies or little defective children, any who had not their full share of life. Then at last he became a Canon of Westminster, and had the joy of living in that beautiful and mysterious little Cloister, under the shadow of the Abbey, where the ghosts of the mighty past seem to fill the air with voices. But he never forgot Toynbee Hall or his East Londoners. Up to the last it was his greatest joy to show them round that most beautiful of Abbeys, the jewel of England's heart.

His was an influence which, once felt, seems to live on regardless of death. Reading the pages of his book, how often his presence seems to live again, so tender, so strong, the most Christ-like of men, and yet filled to the tips with eager life and interest, scintillating stars of paradox and gentle humour, critical and yet kindly, stimulative and yet restraining! No mean thought, no base work, no dastardly action could live in the light of that eye. He could never remain indifferent in the presence of evil. It is still remembered in India how, in the presence of the Viceroy and his court, he stepped forward and openly rebuked a great aristocrat for beating his Indian servant. Mrs. Barnett describes how suddenly he took an impostor by the throat and turned him out of his house. His physical strength seemed suddenly to become the "strength of ten" when so challenged.

Once when we were standing on the deck of a steamer in the Mediterranean we noticed that many migrant birds were settling on the ship, exhausted by their long journey. Some sailors came out with cages and began plucking the birds from the rigging of the ship. Barnett watched this for a short time, then he said suddenly, "I can stand this no longer!" He went aft and approached the sailors. Very gently he pleaded with them. He pointed out that the birds were the guests of the ship, that they were offending against the laws of hospitality. He did not rage or threaten. He put the highest ideal before them, as was always his way. Then I saw the sailors open their cages and let the birds free, and Barnett came back to me smiling happily. "I knew that they would understand!" he said triumphantly. That little incident often comes back to memory as embodying his whole lifelong method in his strife with the world and the evil of the world. He did not strive or cry. He did not curse or condemn. He showed the better way. He lived the better way himself. That was his true source of strength.

It was part of his power that he was ever a learner. He profoundly believed in knowledge as a source of goodness. But he was not a great scholar himself or even a very learned man. He did not set out to be such. He was a simple man, seeking for light and preaching light. The pedants scoffed. But it was precisely because he, not being learned, yet preached knowledge, that he obtained so large a following. Education to him was the road of conduct; it took the place of the old "wisdom." Preaching thus, he gained more converts for knowledge than even the Universities with all their pride of learning. It was simply one instance of his almost uncanny power of persuasion—of leading humanity along the better path.

Such is the life story that Mrs. Barnett has to tell; and she tells it worthily. No compression will do justice to that varied story of works and sayings, so useful at the present moment. For Barnett was a true teacher of "reconstruction." It was the very work in which he and his wife were engaged all through their partnership. To reconstruct modern life on new lines, to escape from the vicious circles of the past, to see that joy was to be spread in "wider commonalty," to clear civilisation of its black shadows—those were their aims for nearly fifty years. They achieved much; but more remains to be done. It is the aim of a biography to prolong the life of a man's spirit; and it is his spirit which we need to-day.

The reading of this book will strengthen us for the tasks before us. For we are drawn into the life and warmth of a large community of kindred souls—Barnett's disciples—often differing, but all inspired by one common purpose. That purpose is now within the reach of all. For it is nothing more nor less than to see that the poorest man on this planet shall have a chance of rising to the height of his manhood.

HAROLD SPENDER.

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE FIFTH ARMY.

ONE of the early tasks of the new Parliament will be, if present intentions remain firm, to order an inquiry into the case of General H. P. Gough and into the circumstances of the defeat suffered by the Fifth and Third British Armies last March. This task will be urged upon the House of Commons by the Labour Party. The stigma which rests upon General Gough, who was deprived of his command without court-martial or inquiry, rests also upon the Fifth Army, and it is strongly felt by the leaders of the Labour Party that justice demands full investigation.

My own opinion, after watching the retreat in progress and after studying the circumstances carefully from Intelligence records, was that General Gough had been unfairly treated, and that the impression prevailing at the time in England was based upon ignorance of the facts. I attempted to correct this impression at the time. General Headquarters would not permit it. It was not thought desirable then to show up the falseness of the view taken by many English reviews and newspapers that upon the Fifth Army lay the responsibility for the loss of so much ground to the enemy; that this Army was badly handled and therefore unable to put up a stout resistance; and that it "let down" the Third Army, which, but for the collapse of the Fifth, would have been able to hold its ground.

That view in my opinion is grotesquely at odds with the truth. Its acceptance was due, I think,

- (1) To the refusal of the public to believe anything written by war correspondents, a refusal for which I do not blame the public, considering how often they had been deceived before they realised the conditions under which war correspondents worked.
- (2) To the loose and exaggerated accounts of the retreat given by wounded men of the units which went to the relief of the Fifth Army.
- (3) To the statement made in the House of Commons by the Prime Minister, with incomplete knowledge and misunderstanding of important facts.
- (4) To the treatment of General Gough.

If I venture, now that reasons for silence no longer exist, to ask for a reconsideration of the part played by the Fifth Army, it is because I hate injustice, and because, as a war correspondent who was on the spot, I happen to be able to discuss the matter with some special knowledge. I heard accounts of the battle within a few days from the Staffs of most of the divisions engaged; in some cases from brigade staffs, and even battalion commanders. I saw the successive phases of the retreat for myself, as I had seen beforehand the positions in which our troops awaited the attack and the preparations made in the rear of those positions for defensive action in the event of the front line being overrun. I will say at once that I considered those preparations inadequate, but for this General Gough was not, I submit, solely or even chiefly to blame. Recollect what happened. During January,

at the urgent request of the French Ministry, against the judgment not only of Field-Marshal Haig, but even of the French Generals, the British Army took over forty fresh miles of front, stretching roughly from St. Quentin to La Fère. Along this front the Fifth Army was strung out, its line perilously thin. From the moment of our taking over this territory it was surmised that the heaviest weight of the German attack would be thrown against it. A wise Commander always drives at his enemy's weakest point. Also the German High Command was known to favour striking at the point of junction between Allied forces, a point where, owing to difference of language and system, confusion is especially apt to occur. British G.H.Q. knew, thanks to the activity of the Intelligence Department under General Cox (whose accidental death deprived the Army of a painstaking and vigorous officer), where the blow would fall. Most Generals of division refused to believe that there would be any blow. A fortnight before the offensive opened I heard from the staff of one of the Fifth Army divisions that they could not see why G.H.Q. had warned them to be prepared. But neither at Fifth Army Headquarters nor at Montreuil did any illusion prevail. Since he knew that the Fifth Army would be attacked with vast numbers, and knew also its weakness, Sir Douglas Haig must be blamed no less than General Gough if the preparations were inadequate.

I have a note in my diary of a conversation I had with General Gough as early as January 30th. He said then: "The Germans might very likely attack his Army front and would probably gain some ground if they did. The best line of defence would be the line of the Somme. Until they got across that there would be no tragedy. It might be a tragedy if they did." That view had been discussed with G.H.Q., and G.H.Q. knew the strength of the Somme and other defences quite as well as General Gough. Yet very little was done to improve our positions anywhere. I recollect thinking, some weeks after the enemy had been brought to a standstill before Amiens, when trenches were being dug and wired in every direction and to a great depth even behind Amiens, that if the British Army had done half this amount of work before the 21st of March, there would have been no retreat.

About that retreat, and especially the Fifth Army part in it, many absurd stories were afloat. What was particularly unfortunate was that American soldiers arriving in France were apt to be told that British troops became a disorderly rabble, that officers lost their heads, that men wandered like sheep without a shepherd, and that their unworthy conduct caused a grave setback to the Allied cause. Such stories were, I dare say, set agoing, many of them, by spies and traitors, very likely by paid German agents. They were repeated by habitual grumblers, by those who like to "seem to know," and even by many who passed on this kind of talk merely because they had nothing better to say. One story which was widely told represented General Gough as having dined in London on the night of March 21st!!

That the Fifth Army yielded more ground than the Third

Army is indisputable. Hasty critics jumped to the conclusion that it did not fight so well. That was unjustifiable. Both armies fought with a dogged courage that has not been surpassed in any battle of the war. The reason for the Fifth Army's retirement lay in this, that it consisted of fourteen divisions, eleven in the line, three in reserve, and that it was attacked by forty-eight. Fourteen against forty-eight! That tells the whole story. No, not quite the whole, either, for this must be said, too, that the eleven divisions in the line were spread over a front of forty miles. Three miles is considered a very long front for a division to hold. These Fifth Army divisions each held nearly four. The task of the Fifth Army was therefore terrific in every way. Yet this was not clearly stated at the time, nor has the story, I think, been fairly told since the event. The instinct to seize upon a scapegoat when things go wrong is one of the most powerful instincts in human nature. Before the facts were known in England, the Fifth Army was blamed for what had happened. The public had thought, we had all hoped, that our line would stand firm against attack. That some territory might be gained by the enemy was known among those who studied the position on the spot. But no one expected the old Somme battlefields to be lost. The disappointment was hard to bear, and someone had to bear the brunt of public irritation. Hurried judgment, hurried glances at the map, made the Fifth Army appear to be the culprit. Then General Gough was sent home. So the slander started. It has been running long enough.

The first count of the indictment against the Fifth Army was that it had been taken by surprise. There is no truth in that. I read day by day during February and March the reports of its Intelligence branch. There I found evidence cumulative and convincing that the Germans were preparing to attack the Fifth Army front. Now attention would be called to increase in the number of their hospitals and aerodromes, now to the multiplication of shell dumps, or to the improvement of roads and railways in the rear. All the divisions were warned to be ready. Even the date of the attack was discovered forty-eight hours in advance, and orders were given for the troops to stand to in their positions from 11 p.m. on March 20th. Mr. Bonar Law said in the House of Commons that there were some elements of surprise in the German attack. What they were I do not know. I have stated the fact.

That the enemy hoped to surprise us is certain. In the tactics which they developed during three years' close study of the best methods of forcing a fortified front, the element of surprise was given a prominent place. The well-informed military critic of the "*Neue Freie Presse*" told his readers this before the offensive began. In every one of their attacks the Germans took elaborate precautions to keep their intentions secret both from us and from their own troops. The specially trained assault battalions which formed the hammer-head of their phalanx were moved up only at the latest possible moment. Officers were given sealed instructions. Rumours were spread through the German armies of probable attacks in a number of directions, so that the direction decided upon might be effectually con-

ceased. The difficulty of concealment was increased by the formation which welded the attacking troops and the reserves into a solid mass. This moved forward as a mass; without any slowing down of the forward movement fresh divisions took the places of those which had shot their bolt. The relieving troops passed through those which were to be taken out of the line, and when their turn came for rest, they were relieved in the same way. The process was called "leap-frogging," and gave the enemy useful results. But in no case, excepting that of the attack on April 9th, which succeeded beyond expectation for another reason, did their blow fall without warning. That which they struck on March 21st was, as I have shown, awaited by us with full knowledge that it was about to fall.

Next, the Fifth Army has been reproached with neglecting to make for itself sufficiently strong positions. The answer to this is twofold. First, the French, when they handed over the line from Gouzeaucourt north of Saint Quentin to Barisis south of La Fère, handed over good positions. General Gough told me soon after the taking over that he was glad to find such excellent work done. This work was to some extent improved by us, and so far as was possible, it was a strong line that we held. I say "so far as possible," because (1) it was not considered possible to call upon the men who had come from hard fighting in the north to do hard digging as soon as they took over; (2) it is impossible that even good positions can be very strong if there are not enough men in them to defend themselves against attack by largely superior numbers. This is the second answer to the charge that the Fifth Army did not take necessary precautions for the repelling of the attack at the outset. It did what was possible with the men at its disposal. It had not a continuous system of trenches in the front line. It had instead a series of redoubts, or fortified posts, each intended to "cover" so much of the front by machine-gun and rifle fire. If there had not been a thick fog on the morning of the 21st, these redoubts would have delayed the enemy, but they could not have prevented him from getting past them. The lines behind were well dug and defended. My own opinion is that the positions prepared for the troops to fall back upon, one after another, in the event of their being hard pressed, might have been more effectively wired. But that criticism applies with equal force to the Third Army front.

There are no soldiers in the world who could have stood up against such odds and held back an enemy attacking in the proportion of more than three to one. For what did this mean? Not merely that the masses of Germans who flowed over our positions were always more numerous than our men. It meant also that our men, fighting all the time, weary and dazed with the battle, found every day that they were faced by fresh troops, troops who had rested and slept, troops who came into the battle with new vigour. The Germans had so many divisions that they could take them out of the line as soon as they were tired and let them recover. Our men had no intervals. They were on their feet day and night. When they were not fighting, they were falling back or hastily improving old defensive posi-

tions. They grew so heavy-headed from want of sleep that officers had to go round shaking them to keep them awake. Numbers of them fell by the roadside and slept from exhaustion. This largely swelled the number of prisoners taken by the enemy. Yet throughout the six days of the battle there was nothing approaching a rout or a panic, there was no disorder on the roads. I have seen other retreats with these features. In this retreat there was hardly so much as disorganisation on any large scale.

What seems like disorganisation to the troops who are put in to relieve badly-hammered divisions, is nothing but the inevitable result of the hammering. When there is such a bombardment as the Germans sent over on the morning of March 21st, and when it is followed by masses of troops trained to assault tactics, the battalions which meet the impact have most of their officers and sergeants killed or wounded. They do in some cases find natural leaders, and when this happens they go on fighting vigorously. There were many such cases in this battle. Here is one example. A sergeant of artillery in the 6th Division had his gun knocked out by a direct hit. He offered himself to the nearest infantry command. He was asked to take a platoon and do the work of a lieutenant. He led his platoon with gallantry and success for a couple of days. At last in a tight place their ammunition ran out. He was last seen killing Germans with a pickaxe.

But often it does not happen that natural leaders present themselves. Then the men, especially if they are suffering from want of sleep, are apt to wander away to the rear in a more or less dazed and dispirited condition. The fresh troops who are relieving them see that they are in bad shape, and sometimes they talk as if they had met the survivors of a disaster. In the battle of St. Quentin no disaster happened. If our line had been pierced and the Germans had poured through and rolled up our divided forces, that would have been disastrous. But this did not occur, and the reason why it did not occur was that the men who withdrew fighting kept the line all the time unbroken. They were dropping with fatigue, they were dirty, footsore, heavy-eyed. From hunger few of them suffered, thanks to the devotion and steadiness of the Army Service Corps and to the regularity of the regimental arrangements for distributing rations. But what they suffered from weariness no one can imagine. Yet they kept their faces towards the enemy. They never let him get through.

Thus they spoiled his plan. He undoubtedly hoped to pierce the British line and throw our forces into catastrophic disorder. It was plain from the articles which were appearing in German and Austrian newspapers before the offensive began, and from the talk which we knew to be current among German officers in the field, that the enemy believed he could by the use of his new tactics reach, if not a decisive result, such as an Arjesh or a Caporetto, at all events such a harvest as Mackensen reaped on the Dunaetz and during the months of close pursuit which followed.

The German High Command did not underestimate the value

of the Allied troops on the Western Front. They paid the British Army the highest compliment by delaying operations against it until they could bring into the field vastly superior numbers and a weight of artillery unthought of hitherto. On one part of our front they had a gun to every fifteen yards: we had one to every eighty-five. It was their resolve to deserve success by piling up an immense preparation which gave them such results as they achieved. Many hold still that the German military machine, so long elaborated, failed to justify the expectations of those who made it. It certainly did not do what the British Navy did for a long time (until the submarine war developed its full vigour) to make good claims set up before the war. The German armies won their victories against weaker forces; weaker in munitions, as the Russians were; or weaker in preparations generally, like the forces of mishandled Roumania; or weaker, far weaker in numbers, as were the British forces in the battle of Saint Quentin. But herein we see a proof of the ability and foresight of the German General Staff.

The Germans did their best to represent our retirement as a rout. That was to be expected. But it is surprising that British newspapers and reviews should have adopted this view. I suppose such opinions were based upon the lurid and incomplete stories told by "men who were there." When troops suffer a reverse, there are always some of them who say that they only fell back because others did. "We were holding on all right. We had the enemy in front of us and we could have stayed there for ever. But when the fellows on our right (or on our left, as the case may be) were pushed back, we had to keep in line with them. We had to get back, too." It is a familiar complaint; there is usually very little in it.

All soldiers are apt to think too much about their own unit, their own particular little bit of front, and not enough about the front as a whole. This is understandable enough, when you consider how small a part the soldier sees of a battle "as a whole." It is understandable, and as a rule no harm is done by it. Those who are in command of the operations have had the entire battlefield under their eyes. They know what really happened and what were the hidden causes of the movements made. But they cannot speak out till long after the event. It is, therefore, I think, desirable to point out briefly where those err who lay the blame for our retirements during the battle of Saint Quentin upon this or that unit, whether Army or Division. The same stories were told by the troops of both the Third and the Fifth Armies, stories of finding themselves with their flanks in the air; of learning suddenly that the Germans were behind them. The same methods were employed against both, and they had the same success at the outset. They were employed against the Fifth, however, with greater violence and with a much larger number of divisions. So far as I can judge, the sole reason why the troops of the Fifth Army were forced back is that the enemy were in the proportion of nearly four to one against them.

Yet even with this vast superiority the Germans would not have been able to overrun our front as quickly as they did, if they had

not had a dense fog to help them. Under cover of this fog they penetrated some points of our thinly-held front line, and as our forces were too small for the undertaking of counter-attacks on a large scale, we were compelled to fall back to positions prepared in advance by the Fifth Army staff as a precaution against such an onrush as the enemy were making now. Upon these positions the northern and central portions of the Army were instructed to retire, fighting steadily and taking care not to lose touch with one another. These instructions were obeyed by the divisions involved, and the trench system known as the battle-line was occupied with far less confusion than one would think inevitable under such difficult conditions. Wherever the connection between two divisions was threatened by enemy penetrations, counter-attacks were delivered and portions of the line reinforced. What the Germans did was to try and force their way, in an infinite number of small parties, along little valleys, roads, hedges, anywhere that afforded cover, and so to insinuate themselves between our units.

In all retirements the getting away of the guns is one of the first considerations. Orders were issued by the Fifth Army staff for alternate batteries to be withdrawn, one after another, both of field guns and of heavies. Provision was also made for the garrisons of the redoubts in the forward zone to be withdrawn as their covering value ceased. Unfortunately some of these garrisons had been wiped out before that moment arrived.

Evening of March 21st found the troops belonging to the northern and central parts of the Fifth Army in their new positions. The southern part had not been so heavily pressed, but that night orders were sent to it to fall back also and to form a line in consonance with that of the other parts. Air reports at this time showed that the country behind the enemy's attacking line was filled with troops, who were being brought up from a number of directions. It was clear that all available reserves were to be thrown in. The attacks went on without ceasing. Dense waves of Germans followed one another at short intervals. Our small force was plainly not capable of keeping off such large numbers of the enemy. A fresh withdrawal had therefore to be contemplated, and, with this in view, certain units were ordered to dig in, so that they might hold the line for a time while the main body carried out an orderly retirement. Where the enemy pressed so hard as to create a critical situation, reinforcements were put in, but the policy adopted was, in general, to fall back towards the reserves, fighting rearguard actions, and destroying as great a number of the enemy as possible while he came on. At points where a definite piercing of our line was threatened, cavalry, and tanks were employed to protect it.

Friday, March 22nd, found the British troops very hard beset. New and violent attacks were made upon them. The Germans who attacked were fresh troops. Our men were already tired. They fought, however, stubbornly, and only yielded ground as they were ordered. Our retirement continued at a rate which permitted the withdrawal of artillery. We retired on to positions which had been dug beforehand, and the bridges were destroyed as soon as our troops had passed over them so as to delay the

enemy's follow-up movement. It was now the final zone that we were to occupy. Certain places had to be held at all costs in order to protect the retiring forces from being attacked as they fell back. The orders given for the defence of these points were carried out with magnificent devotion. Still fighting all the while, and still an organised force acting under command, the troops of the Fifth Army took up their positions in the final zone. On our right the French were arriving, which made the situation easier. The British commanders in this area were told to co-operate with our Allies in every way, and to place themselves under the orders of the French generals.

The Fifth Army line at midnight on the 22nd ran along the Crozat Canal, then along the Somme as far as Ham, then northward through Monchy Lagache, through Vraignes, east of Beaumetz and Brusle, through Tincourt, east of Nurlu. In the course of forty-eight hours we had fallen back between seven and eight miles. On the northern part of the battlefield the troops of the Third Army, being equally hard pressed, had covered almost as much ground in their retirement. But from now on the weight of the attack fell far more upon the Fifth Army than upon the Third. The German plan since the offensive started has been to advance obliquely. Their forces have not pushed straight forward, but with a swinging movement either to right or left. That was the plan which they followed in the later Russian engagements. They adopted it in Italy. In this case their effort was made from right to left, in a south-westerly direction, which brought their pressure chiefly against the Fifth Army. They did attempt, it is true, to widen their attacking front by a blow against our lines in front of Arras, but this blow, delivered on March 28th, was parried with complete success, and they did not try to repeat it.

I have brought the story of the Fifth Army retirement down to midnight on the 22nd of March. By the next morning it was clear that the positions then held could not be maintained in face of the huge German concentration of force. The line Somme-Peronne-Albert-Gommecourt and its extension northwards to Arras was rapidly prepared for occupation. The troops on the left of the Fifth Army were ordered to move backward in conformity with the Corps on the right, which was to retire gradually behind the Somme. These troops were to keep close touch with those of the Third Army and not to move until the latter were ready. That night the right Corps of the Fifth Army was relieved by the French, but the enemy continued to press the Allied forces with very large numbers, swiftly moved. On the 24th they occupied Saily-Saillisel and Combles, and still pushed forward, our men being now too exhausted to do more than delay their advance by rearguard actions. Counter-attacks on any effective scale were not to be thought of.

The line on the night of the 24th ran from the junction with the French south-east of Nesle to Morchain, then west of the Somme Canal and south of the Somme River, then across the Somme to Maricourt and Longueval. Longueval had been hardly pressed. The pressure was relieved for the moment by a fine action on the

part of the Tank Corps men armed with Lewis guns, but the oncoming enemy could not be held for long. The rapidity of his advance, due to the weight of the attack, caused constant changes in the situation. These were dealt with coolly and capably by the Fifth Army staff. I was frequently at their headquarters during the retirement, and can add personal testimony to the calm and business-like atmosphere which prevailed there. Everyone was working very hard. Bed was out of the question. Meals were snatched as opportunity allowed. Many officers did not take their clothes off during the whole of the battle. But there was no panic or excitement. I saw no signs of indecision. Orders in detail were sent out to each Corps at frequent intervals, showing the next positions to be taken up and the connections to be made. The arrangements for handing over command to the French as they came in were made so efficiently as to avoid confusion. Fresh units were formed to reinforce those parts of the line which were dangerously thin. The most notable of these was Carey's Force. Composed of all the men who could be got together, whether fighting men or not, and put under the command of Major-General Carey from the 20th Division,* this body of between two and three thousand did excellent work in front of Villers-Bretonneaux. By such measures our line was kept intact and our powers of resistance were maintained. Never for an instant did the Fifth Army staff lose grip of the situation.

All the accounts of the retirement, which ended on March 26, when the remains of the Fifth Army (most of its divisions having by this time been sent out of the line to rest) concentrated upon the defence of the approaches to Amiens, show that it was characterised by hard, steady fighting, always against overwhelming odds, and that the continual changes of position made necessary were all ordered after careful calculation and in concert with other parts of the line. At critical points prolonged resistance was called for. Several times perilous pressure was relieved by timely counter-attacks. So the piercing of the British line, the aim of the enemy, the threat which hung over us during that week of epic struggle, was prevented. There was no crowning victory for the Germans, no disaster for British arms.

That escape we owe in chief to the troops engaged. No staff work, however painstaking, can serve unless the dispositions planned are stoutly and steadily carried out. But there is much for which we have to thank the staff of the Fifth Army, and that has not been sufficiently admitted. Now is the injustice done both to General Gough and to the troops of his command exposed. I have tried to show how unfair has been the treatment of the Army Commander and the stigma cast upon the good name of his Army. I hope, when Parliament meets, that the wrong may be repaired.

HAMILTON FYFE.

* Though not, as the Prime Minister told the House of Commons, collected by him, for he did not take command until the force was in the field.

DOWNFALL.

THERE is no record in history of a Great Power so suddenly crashing to the ground as Germany did in November, 1918.

Her armies were still in the field fighting on the whole with desperate valour and to the very last the German generals proclaimed that the Western front could not be broken and that their public could rest assured that in a few weeks time the line would be stabilised for the winter, when the Allies could no longer advance. We, of course, know that in those few weeks the position of the German armies might well have become desperate. But having made the great throw, one would have imagined that a great military nation like the Germans, bred in the traditions of Frederick the Great and the school of Bismarck, would have preferred to go down fighting rather than submit to the humiliating terms which were imposed in the armistice. No one could have predicted such a startling end with the German fleet intact, and the German armies still in being.

Seven months before, in March, Germany was at the zenith of her success. Russia lay prostrate at the feet of the conqueror, and there was none to gainsay the treaty of Brest-Litovsk. Rumania had been knocked out, Italy had received a severe blow and was still in need of assistance, while the German armies appeared to offer an irresistible front to the Allies on the west. The lengthening and consequent weakening of the British line in France had not escaped the attention of the German General Staff. If there was a cloud on the Atlantic the U-boats might be trusted to do their work of destruction, and with a little courage the final blow might be dealt before the Americans came in force. Such was the prospect which was presented to the German public early in March, 1918, when the peace treaty with Russia was published. The German Government while it secretly prepared for the great blow in the west, turned the attention of the public to the East. The comments of the Press were perhaps less enthusiastic than might have been expected, but by vigorously pulling the strings, the Government made sure that the right moral was pointed—that force was the only argument to which the enemy would listen. If it was impossible to conceal from the public that the war spirit of the Entente was as stern as ever, the German Press proclaimed that Germany would not suffer, for she would be victorious in the West. Victorious in the West! Everything admittedly depended on that.

Most remarkable was the attitude of the Socialists. Mr. Bevan reminds us that as early as the spring of 1916, under the pressure of the blockade, there was a certain amount of darkly heaving unrest throughout the working classes of Germany. He shows in his book on "German Social Democracy during the War," what a strong appeal the leaders of the Minority Socialists made at one time to the masses in Germany. It is customary to describe the resolution which was accepted by the Reichstag in July, 1917, as a smoke-cloud meant to screen the designs of the Government. The Government proved that they had no intention of being bound by what the Jingoës regarded as a fantastic

formula against annexations and indemnities. But there is no doubt that the resolution corresponded with a genuine movement of public opinion. Nor must we underrate the importance of the October crisis, and the fall of Michaelis. When the outlook appeared doubtful, the Government had to pay lip service to the growing demand for peace. But they knew that with the sun of victory rising in the East Germany would respond to the call of battle once more in the West. She did so, and the leaders of the Minority Socialists, who shortly before were on the way to become the leaders of the Majority, found themselves deserted by the great bulk of their followers. "Vorwärts" explained with an air of apology that protests against the Brest-Litovsk treaty were useless, and employed its ingenuity in endeavouring to persuade the working classes of Germany that adhesion to the July resolution was not incompatible with the terms that had been imposed on the Bolsheviks. In vain did Wendel in the "Frankfurter Volkstimme" denounce the Russian settlement in the name of German Democracy. The bye-election at Niederbarnim pointed the way which the wind was blowing. The anarchy and licence of the Russian revolution had been employed to alarm the German people, who were ready to accept the harshest measures against such barbarians. The day of the Minority Socialists was for the time being over. Their power over the masses was lost until they were able to raise their heads again during the disastrous days of the great retreat on the West. Their authority slipped away from them, because it was not based on the acceptance of their principles by the German people. The Minority programme was merely a refuge in time of distress which could be discarded, when success seemed once more assured. And so in March, 1918, as in August, 1914, the German nation ranged itself behind its Kaiser for a war of conquest. Once more it was promised that before the leaves fell the fruits of a victorious peace would be garnered and again it allowed itself to be deceived.

And yet there was a great difference between the situation in March, 1918, and that of August, 1914, and the German Government and General Staff could hardly have been blind to it. The strength and the moral of the German people had been profoundly affected by nearly four years of war and privation, during which dazzling hopes of victory and the expectation of more abundant supplies had so often fallen to the ground. The boasted discovery of a land overflowing with corn and meat had once more proved to be a mirage. Eager as the German people were for victory, they were still more anxious for peace. "We must have peace, peace *sans phrases*," said the "Hamburger Echo," voicing the general desire. "If it cannot be peace let it be an armistice." Did Hamburg feel the spirit of unrest already moving in the fleet? These were ominous words, when the nation was to be called upon for a great effort. But what was the use of all the victories in Russia and Rumania, if German stomachs were still filled with substitutes for food, and German bodies were left shivering in clothes of paper fabric? Brilliant as the situation appeared to be on the maps, which were hung

out at every German bookseller's shop, the blockade grew still tighter and the demand for more tolerable conditions of life had to be met.

The German Government decided to meet it with a promise that this time the blank cheque which the Germans gave their Emperor in August, 1914, would be filled in without failure. On March 12, while the public were still under the glamour of the terms which had been dictated to Russia, Hindenburg arrived in Berlin to hold a conference with the Kaiser, and at this conference the decision to throw everything into a last blow for victory on the West was made. If this failed the German Government could have been under no illusion as to what would happen. They must have known that this time they were making their last bid for "World-power," and that if it failed "Downfall" would follow. They could hardly have been so blind, as not to see that the German people, docile as they were, would never stand the shock of another great reverse like the battles of Verdun.

It may well be imagined that it was an anxious conference. But if the old Field-Marshal had any doubt of success he was overruled and the die was cast. He knew accurately what reserves Germany had. But if he hesitated, Ludendorff was at hand to promise success, and the Kaiser, who could not believe that the god of battles would desert Germany, supported the General who guaranteed victory. No stone was left unturned to raise the moral of the German people. We may gather from the steps which were taken that the Government was still nervous on this score. The pacifists might prove troublesome if the campaign was prolonged; and so the story was invented and duly embellished in the Press, that serious overtures for peace had been made which had been contemptuously rejected by the Entente. The more bellicose speeches of British and French statesmen were quoted to prove that the enemy desired to destroy Germany, and that the prolongation of the war was necessary. Thus the new offensive was represented as a war of defence. It had always been a war of defence, said the Jingo papers, and many articles were written to prove once more that Russia backed by England had been the villain of the piece.

The General Staff pretended that they regretted the necessity of striking yet another blow against France, who if she were reasonable could have an advantageous peace for the asking. Hindenburg and Ludendorff gave interviews in which they deplored the necessity of inflicting further punishment on France. They said that they would gladly spare that unhappy country further devastation. "France," said Hindenburg on March 15 to the correspondent of the "*Kölnische Zeitung*," has dug her own grave. She is bleeding to death. But the vanity of the French and their passion for Alsace-Lorraine are being exploited by the English and the war must therefore go on."

"And this time," said Ludendorff, "the question of arriving at peace can only be solved as in the East by a good German peace. No other can be of any use to us."

"And mark you," exclaimed the two great Generals, "if we

held out in 1917 with numerically inferior numbers, think what we can now do with numerically superior numbers on the Western front!"

"How strange all this boasting seems in the light of subsequent events! During all this time there was a conspiracy of silence in the German Press about the American preparations. If anyone alluded to what America might be doing or to the landing of American troops, he was told that the bulk of the American Army would never reach France, and that those who had already appeared, were quite worthless. Encouraging stories were given of what the few American soldiers who had been captured said about America's unwillingness to fight. The Yankees were still bluffing; how could they raise an army which would face the Germans? All this seems to have been believed. Presently the submarines were to appear off the coast of America to reassure the public. It has since been admitted that the German General Staff were themselves deceived. They did not believe that more than forty thousand Americans a month could reach France during the summer of 1918, and they regarded them as poor material. This was their great miscalculation, and when the arrival of the Americans by the hundred thousand a month could no longer be concealed from the German people, it was the final blow to their shattered hopes.

The German General Staff, however misled they were about the United States, made another and still more incomprehensible blunder. They had not the numerical superiority to follow up their blows when the offensive began. They either failed to foresee the resistance which would be offered, or they deliberately closed their eyes and took the risk as part of the gamble. A curious incident occurred at this time and that was the publication of the Lichnowski memorandum in the German papers. But so far from being damaging to the public moral at home the memorandum was received with an almost universal chorus of denunciation and ridicule. Thus the German Government were satisfied that the moral of their people had been tuned up to the proper pitch.

So far all had gone well. But when the offensive actually began, the debate of March 22 showed that there was still an undercurrent of pacific feeling that might break forth in fuller volume, if the campaign did not go well. In the course of the discussion Herr David, speaking for the Majority Socialists, declared that the recent bye-election had proved that the country was behind the Government. To this Herr Haase retorted:—"The masses have been befooled and bewildered, but they will come back ultimately to the old Social Democratic principles." Herr Haase did not know how truly he was speaking. But he had the courage to raise his standard once more and he knew that in proportion as the hopes of the German people were raised to fever pitch, their awakening was likely to be more decisive. Therein lay the danger to the plans of the General Staff.

During March and April the political situation in Germany was dominated by the success of the campaign in the West. It blotted out any public apprehension that might have been felt

about Austria, and the course of the war in Palestine. Italy was not thought of. Her turn would come next. The war was followed with breathless interest amid the trumpetings of the Jingo Press and fulsome reports of the Kaiser's doings at the front. There was no way out for the world, said "Vorwärts" at this time, save a complete German victory. It was grieved to think that this might lead to a peace of violence involving new wars. But Germany cared nothing about that. She was certain of victory, counting the captured guns and prisoners, with her towns beflagged and bells ringing. Abstract speculation about morality and justice had no interest for the German public, when victory with all its spoils, and recompenses for their losses, seemed at hand.

But how slow-footed events were! The war seemed endless. About mid-April there were signs of anxiety. There were reports that the Americans were eluding the U-boats and coming in great numbers. But these fears were drowned in the roar of the giant cannon that began to bombard Paris. "The 'old Tiger' is living through evil days." And so through the palmy days of April into May, bringing "proof of German courage, forethought, and leadership." If there were temporary checks, they could easily be explained away by the necessity of preparing for even greater blows. Foch's reserves were said to be exhausted; the losses of the enemy were overwhelming. The German soldiers had never had so few casualties. Naturally, the effect of all this was a movement still further away from the July resolution. The advocates of that resolution now argued that even "a Hindenburg peace" could be squared with their principles, since "the Entente refuse any compromise."

Rumours of Austria's desire to end the war added, however, to the anxieties of the public, and when April drew to a close, and no decision was reached, the Majority block in the Reichstag showed a sudden desire for a return to more pacific views. The agitation for equal franchise in Prussia raised its head once more. In various ways the dark side of Germany's economic life broke through the glitter of the military pageant. The time of the most severe privation before the harvest was approaching. The scare about the failure of the U-boats was not removed by the glib assurances of Admiral Capelle. It was whispered that the English had opened the dams of Flanders and drowned, some said, as many as eighty thousand German soldiers. Their terrible sacrifices began to tell on the nerves of the Germans. Even the publication of the terms of the peace treaty with Rumania failed to evoke any enthusiasm. On May 14 the Socialists made a violent attack on the internal administration of the Government, which began to feel the ground quake beneath its feet. The changes in the political situation during this time correspond to the gradual awakening of the German people to the fear that the great offensive might not prove decisive. At the end of May we hear Erzberger's voice declaring that a peace by understanding is the only practical as well as the only Christian way of ending the war. A strange figure this of Erzberger, half-believer half-intriguer, who flits through the labyrinths of German politics,

issuing now warnings, now exhortations, but not without insight. He chose his opportunity well for at this time the Germans were threatened with a reduction of their bread ration and the early potato crop failed.

All this pointed to the necessity of a new and frantic effort for success. The second blow of the offensive was struck on May 27th, and the capture of the Chemin des Dames instilled new courage into the German public. Hindenburg and Ludendorff were once more the national heroes. But when the new offensive was checked, the demand for the statement of war aims became more insistent. This was not diminished when the new Austrian offensive against Italy trickled away like a flood into the sands. The military operations hung fire during June and on June 24 Germany was startled by a speech from von Kühlmann. An end, he said, could hardly be expected through military decisions alone, owing to the enormous forces of the enemy. Kühlmann's speech was hotly attacked by the Jingo Press, and Hertling tried to explain it away. He was made to apologise for it. But it was believed that he could not have spoken without the authority of the Government, and the "All-Highest." The public moral was weakened at the very time when it needed strengthening. Ludendorff, however, was still supreme, and the German armies were thrown into the furnace once more. They reached Chateau Thierry, and then the counter-attack came which was not to pause before they were hurled back almost to their own frontiers. But the legend of the indomitable resistance of the German troops was maintained until the end of August, when Ludendorff at last spoke of the German armies being thrown entirely on the defensive. More ominous still were the words of Freytag-Loringhoven, who compared the German offensive in the West to a sortie from a beleaguered fortress.

Depression began to assume the gaunt aspect of despair, and on September 2 Hindenburg found it necessary to issue an appeal to the public against enemy propaganda. "Only Germans would dare to retreat," ran the official slogan. "Presently the enemy's will to destroy will be broken." But the great military machine was creaking and groaning under the blows of the Allies, and the horrid truth dawned on the German public that the Americans were arriving in overwhelming numbers and that their reserves were inexhaustible. The Home front not only bent but began to break. The Austrian peace Note was the storm signal which led to the demand for a Coalition Government by which the National Liberals and Centre hoped to clip the wings of the Socialists. All these manœuvres were swept away in the landslide of public opinion which followed the news of the collapse of Bulgaria. In vain did the Kaiser try to check the revolutionary spirit by his promise of a democratic constitution. Any statesman, said "Vorwärts," who does not in the present position of affairs support a peace by negotiation deserves to be hanged.

It was too late to call off the avenging fates. Peace at any price was the demand. In vain was the appeal to the public to support a war of national defence. Prince Max, the new Chancellor, was tossed hither and thither on the stormy waters. The Kaiser

flitted backwards and forwards from the front to Berlin like an embarrassed phantom of his former greatness. On his trembling ears fell the demand for his abdication, and on November 3rd the mutiny in the fleet broke out at Kiel. The wheel of revolution had come full circle. In a few days the Kaiser was a fugitive and dynasty after dynasty in Germany came toppling to the ground.

Thus did the consummation arrive which we all hoped for, but hardly dared to believe was possible. The German people turned on their rulers and rid themselves of the tyranny of militarism. The whole edifice with its false façade of democracy collapsed, because the foundations of an Empire built on militarism and the abnegation of morality could stand no long strain. A free people would have held out to the end until the enemy had reached the heart of their country, as the French did in 1871.

The Germans only backed their Government while they thought it could win. They would have supported it in imposing the most humiliating terms on their enemies, as their acceptance of the treaty of Brest-Litovsk proves. But their spirit broke the moment defeat stared them in the face, for the training of their mind and spirit had been based on false ideals.

Nevertheless, we must admit that in spite of the many evils of their military system, the German people showed endurance and fidelity, until the final collapse came. The question is whether these qualities, now freed from the chains of militarism, can be devoted to the cause of liberty and progress. If so, Germany will be saved by her defeat. A great deal will depend on the conquerors. If the spirit and substance of Mr. Wilson's fourteen points, which Germany accepted when she signed the armistice as a pledge against a penal and vindictive peace, are preserved by the Peace Congress, a new and better Germany, purified by her sufferings, may arise. But if the same power-peace which Germany imposed on Russia is imposed on her by the Allies, and Germany is made to pay for generations to come to the uttermost farthing for all the wrong which she has done, then there will be counter-revolution followed perhaps by despair and anarchy in Germany, and that very system of Prussianism which we waged the war to destroy will be established in our land. Then, indeed, the Kaiser and the Junker would have their revenge.

HUGH F. SPENDER.

FACTORS IN POLAND.

FOR four years the Poles have been living at a degree of political tension such as it is probable no other nation, neutral or belligerent, has experienced during the war. The movement of events has been so rapid, the *dénouements* have been so dramatic that even the most imaginative race in Europe, to whom political excitement is as breath in the nostrils, has been left baffled and gasping. The two winds of war and revolution have torn their way through the fabric of Polish national life, searing, cleansing, destroying. Accepted orientations, established traditions, one after another have yielded to the storm; while the grouping and re-grouping of parties and politicians has been like the shifting of the colours in a kaleidoscope.

In this welter, one politician only, M. Roman Dmowski, the National Democrat leader, has preserved a consistent and unvarying attitude. His followers now hope to reap the fruits of his consistency. Two political passions or convictions are ingrained in M. Dmowski—hatred of the German and hatred of the Jew. On all else M. Dmowski is a party leader, the most adroit in Poland, ready to take a programme as he finds it and seek a friendship where he can. But on these two points his convictions transcend the limits of political tactics. They are temperamental. Under no circumstances either for Teuton or for Israelite has he compromise or concession of any kind. Convictions such as these are rare in politics, whether in Poland or elsewhere. They are M. Dmowski's strength. In the early days of the war, when all Poland stood for a short space united in passionate uprising against the Tsar, his enemies execrated M. Dmowski as a "Pro-Russian." To-day he mocks them with the taunt "Pro-German," and the laugh is on his side. In truth there is not much to choose in the vocabulary of Polish abuse between "Pro-Russian" and "Pro-German." But neither taunt was justified. Alike M. Dmowski and his opponents are Polish patriots, neither Pro-Russian nor Pro-German nor Pro-English nor Pro-French, except in so far as they conceive the interests of their country are thereby served. It is true that in the decade which preceded the war M. Dmowski's policy as leader of the Poles in the Duma was "Pro-Russian" in a marked degree. But there was an earlier period (which his opponents did not allow the world to forget) when from the cover of an Austrian newspaper office he thundered with the best of them against Muscovite tyranny, inert Byzantinism, and the rest. There are Poles—there are not many, but there are some—who by long residence in Russia have acquired Russian sympathies and Russian habits of thought, and may truthfully be described as "Pro-Russians." Alexander Lednicki, whom the British Foreign Office seems at one time to have conceived as a possible rival to Dmowski,* is a distinguished example of a Pole of this type. But Dmowski was never of this type. His policy is and always has been opportunist in the choice of means. But Anti-Germanism and Anti-Semitism do not come

* See the Secret Document published by the Bolsheviks in Petrograd, October 31st, 1917, and in the *Manchester Guardian*, December 7th, 1917, in which the Russian Chargé d'Affaires in London says the British Government supports the policy of Dmowski, but would consider the policy of Lednicki, if reliable information could be obtained about him.

for him within the category of means. He conceives them as ends, the two main ends respectively of his country's external and internal policy.

When the famous *Zweikaisermanifest* of November the Fifth, 1916, established a Polish Government at Warsaw, and posed the future of Poland definitively as an international question, Dmowski was an exile knocking vainly at the doors of the French and English Foreign Offices,* his party fissured, his policy in ruins. An almost united Poland acclaimed the Warsaw Government. The outside world waited to see what it would do. The national movements of the nineteenth century illustrate the many different roads by which a country may attain to unity and freedom. Germany attained her unity by her own unaided efforts against a foreign enemy. The circumstances of the present struggle made such a course impossible for Poland. Italy took a different road. The Italian Nationalists attained their goal in 1859 and again in 1866 by calling in a powerful ally and profiting by the difficulties of their adversary. That course was open to Poland from the moment of the Two Emperors' Manifesto onwards. Yet a third course was illustrated in the history of countries like Belgium, which owed their freedom neither to their own efforts nor to the support of an ally, but to international intervention. This course too was open to Poland. It is the course for which she has eventually pronounced, or (to speak more accurately) into which she has drifted. At first it seemed that she had taken the Italian road. That was in the days when the Legions were forming, and the Socialist leader Pilsudski had marched his riflemen into Russia and "redeemed" a Polish town. Nations that have been under oppression have long memories. His countrymen will never forget that first fine flush of Pilsudski's crusade. Poland, like France, is a woman, and responds at the psychological moment to a certain touch of masterful violence. In the hour of Pilsudski's "Invasion of Russia" Poland gave him her heart, and he has not yet lost it. M. Dmowski's recent levies of American Poles have never quite caught the glamour of Pilsudski's Legions in the first twelvemonth of the war.†

When the first Polish Government was set up at Warsaw (Nov., 1916) Pilsudski was clearly indicated as the only possible Minister of War. The obvious pre-requisite for any building of the new State was the transformation of the Legions into a National Army. Pilsudski was a warm advocate of this policy. To outside observers

* The Allied policy at the time was sufficiently divined in Poland, but only became known to the Allied public with the Bolshevik publication of the Secret Document of March 11th, 1917 (in *Manchester Guardian*, December 12th, 1917), by which France recognised Russia's "complete liberty in establishing her Western frontiers."

† The record of the Dmowskian troops, when there has been any fighting to be done, has been not less distinguished: but it must be admitted, their career has been somewhat chequered. The I Corps, composed of Polish conscripts from the old Russian Army, under General Dowbor-Musnicki went over to the Germans after the Bolshevik Revolution, with the idea of keeping Bolshevism out of Poland. Later, having quarrelled with the Germans, they were surrounded by the latter and interned. The same fate befell the II Corps under General Michaelis. A small remnant under Colonel (now General) Haller seems to have made its way through the Ukraine into East Russia, and joined the Czecho-Slovaks. At the end of 1918, M. Dmowski was in Vladivostok, collecting yet another force to co-operate in the Allied invasion of Siberia. A further force was organised in France in return for the Allied recognition of M. Dmowski.

it seemed equally obvious that, if the freedom of Poland was to be won with German aid, the Poles would be compelled to pay the price. Lombardy was won, not only on the fields of Magenta and Solferino, but also in the snows of Crimea. It might indeed be possible by adroit statesmanship to avoid the despatch of Polish troops to fight for Germany in France. But at least it would be necessary generously to relieve the German Eastern Front. These considerations do not seem to have occurred to Pilsudski, or to the other politicians at Warsaw. Almost at the outset the Council of State rejected the principle of compulsory military service (Feb., 1917), the National Army was never formed, and the different parties on the Council gave themselves up to internecine feuds, culminating in German interference, the disbanding of the Legions, and the internment of Pilsudski in a German fortress. There remained, and remains, to Poland only the Belgian road to freedom, the international appeal.

As to the immediate political situation, the kaleidoscope is again being shaken. When the German power collapsed, the three Regents hastened to offer office to the triumphant Dmowskians. M. Dmowski's lieutenant in Warsaw, M. Swiezynski, formed a Ministry in which it was announced that Pilsudski would take the portfolio of War. In fact however Pilsudski, who had only just been released from internment and was still in Germany, had refused any co-operation with the Dmowskians. By his orders one of his lieutenants in Galicia proclaimed a Republic. The Regents hastened to dismiss the Dmowskian Ministry, Swiezynski counter-signing the decree of dismissal. It was the last act of State of the Regents. Pilsudski arrived in Warsaw, assumed dictatorial powers, dismissed the Regents, and constructed a Government exclusively of the Left (Radicals and Socialists, minus the two Bolshevik organisations). Pilsudski has the powerful support of the Jews, who are understood to have secured his promise to stop pogroms. Pogroms, it is to be feared, began as soon as the German power collapsed, though the original reports, spread by Jewish international agencies, may well have been exaggerated. The Dmowskian papers in Poland for some time past have been filled with gleeful accounts of the growing Anti-Semite feeling,* and the outbreaks reported are therefore not surprising. For the moment the Dmowskians are smarting under their discomfiture at Pilsudski's hands; but a new situation may arise if and when M. Dmowski himself, who has reached Paris on his way home from the Far East (where he has been organising yet another of those foreign armies which are to be the salvation of the True Russia), arrives in Poland.

* The curious will find copious extracts in recent numbers of the London weekly *Tygodnik Polski* (Dmowskian propagandist organ, very ably edited: to be obtained from the Polish Victims Relief Fund, 26, Regent Street, S.W. 1.). The following, for example, is a description of the scene at a recent General Meeting of the large Lodz Co-operative Society "Proletariat":

"There were characteristic cries of 'Out with the Jews!' 'Out with the Jew-Gentiles!' 'Out with Trotsky and Lenin!' 'They have done for Russia! You' (that is the to the last degree Hebraised Left of the Polish Socialist Party) 'want to do for Poland!' 'Let us free ourselves from under the yoke of the Jewish gabardine!'" (*Tygodnik Polski*, October 27th, 1918, from *Głos Narodu*.)

It may be added that the new Foreign Minister, M. Wasilewski, is the author of a well-known and very liberal pamphlet on the Jewish question (*Die Judenfrage in Kongresspolen*, Vienna, 1915), in which he vigorously attacks the methods of the National Democrats, in particular the organisation of boycotts of the Jews. The Left, as a whole, too, has always pronounced against Anti-Semitism.

It may be said of course, and it is difficult to find an answer, that the course of events has demonstrated beyond all cavil the futility of "the 'Pro-German' course." It is not for an outsider perhaps at such a moment to express an opinion. There are those who think that Poland gained more by her fidelity in 1812 to the shaken cause of Napoleonic militarism than all that she lost. There are others who hold that Poland has suffered enough from the *beaux gestes*, which are so frequent in her history, and that the new Poland must be built on more material and less dangerous foundations. One thing is now certain. The new Poland will come into being, not by its own efforts, but by an international decision. It will be based on memories, not of united struggle against a common oppressor, but of the triumph of one Polish Party over another, and the ability of an "Emigration" to manipulate the interests of foreign Powers. In such foundations there is no cementing force. A solid base for the new structure in Poland has still to be laid.

A strong Poland is an essential of development, not only in Poland itself, but in Eastern Europe as a whole. But the League of Nations cannot make a strong Poland. It is true they can draw the map as they please. If M. Dmowski has his way—and how far the French and British Governments have committed themselves to M. Dmowski is one of those points on which the public have never been informed—vast areas in Lithuania, the Ukraine, and White Russia will be placed under Polish rule. But a "Great Poland" will not be a strong Poland. The elements of disunion, which it will contain, will be elements, not of strength, but of weakness. It will be a new Austria, an Austria without the Hapsburgs and the Hapsburg tradition of rule. A League of Nations sought to create a "Great Netherlands" in 1815. It was to be a bulwark of defence against Gallic Imperialism, a natural intermediary between Teuton and Latin, and the rest of it. The component nationalities resented the rule of the dominant race, and after fifteen unquiet years the "Great Netherlands" dissolved into its several parts. The strength of nations is a product, not of diplomatic machinery, but of biological growth. Only the Poles themselves can make a strong Poland; and for the sources of such strength they can only look, not to external, but to internal policy.

The internal problems in Russian Poland are more complex than those which await solution in the other States of Eastern Europe. The Baltic Provinces, Lithuania, the Ukraine, Austrian Poland, and in the main even Prussian Poland, are predominantly agricultural countries. In Russian Poland nearly half the population before the War was engaged in industry, and the proportion was rapidly increasing. With this growing industrialisation of what fifty years ago was still a land of "nobles, peasants, priests", the Jewish question is closely connected. The problem of the Jew in countries like Russia and Poland cannot be stated in terms of Western Europe. It is conditioned, not primarily by religious feeling, but by economic conditions. One of the principal factors in the acuteness which the problem has assumed in Eastern Europe, is undoubtedly the restrictions which England and America have imposed in recent years on alien immigration. Mr. Steed, writing of Austria, acutely observes:

"Anti-Jewish feeling can almost invariably be expressed in terms of the percentage of Jews to non-Jews intermingled with

the other elements of a community. When the percentage rises above a certain point—a point determined in each case by the character of the non-Jewish population—Anti-Semitism makes its appearance.” (H. Wickham Steed, “The Hapsburg Monarchy,” London, 1914.)

The danger-point in a profoundly Catholic country like Poland may possibly be lower than elsewhere. It has in any case for some years past patently been exceeded. The restrictions in Old Russia on Jewish ownership of land confined the Polish Jew to the towns. The official Russian policy in recent years of concentrating the Jews in the Western provinces led to a large influx of Russian Jews into Poland (generally called “Lithuanian Jews,” though they do not for the most part come from Lithuania), who compete with the original Polish Jews, and have markedly lowered the standard of living. Before the War there were some 2,000,000 Jews in Russian Poland out of a total population of 9,000,000; and there were towns—Brest is an example—where they amounted to as much as 80 per cent. of the population. They held, and hold, four-fifths of the trade of the country in their hands, and control a large proportion—how large it is not easy from the available statistics to determine—of the capital invested in Polish industry. With the exception of a very small number of wealthy individuals, who would like Judaism to be treated as it is treated in Western Europe, as an affair, not of nationality, but of religion, the Jews in Poland speak a different language, wear a different dress, eat different food, are educated in different schools, and organised in different political parties, to their Christian neighbours. Movements like Zionism, which in West European eyes seem to have a purely visionary appeal, assume an intensely practical significance in the politics of Eastern Europe. The Jewish Question in this part of the world is not one which can be left to solve itself.

The question of the land is as acute in Russian Poland as anywhere in Eastern Europe; but the conditions of the land tenure may be said to be more advanced than in any other East European country with the exception of Prussian Poland. The solution of the agrarian problem in all these countries is the creation of a land-owning peasantry. In Russian Poland such a peasantry already exists. It holds 57.6 per cent. of the land. The large estates represent 34.8 per cent., the Crown Lands only 5.8. This peasant proprietary owes its origin to the Russian Government. After the Polish Rising of 1863 the Government adopted a policy of rigorous repression of the upper and middle classes, who were responsible for the rebellion. The complement of this policy, with which the name of Milutin is associated, was to be conciliation of the peasants, who had taken little part in the rebellion, by a generous programme of land reforms. The Tsar Alexander II. had just abolished serfage. The peasants in Poland were now declared owners of the land, of which they were in occupation; and were given in addition certain rights over the landlords’ forest and pasture, which in the primitive system of peasant agriculture prevailing are of vital importance. At the same time large tracts of land were made available for peasant settlement. The Government had confiscated the estates of land-owners implicated in the rebellion. They had also at their disposal Church lands belonging to the recently dissolved monas-

teries. By utilising this land in the course of the 'sixties of the last century some 917,000 peasant-holdings were formed, and peasants settled on them. The policy was largely conceived, and in the first few years of its application was undoubtedly productive of almost unmixed advantage to the country. Had the population remained stationary, it might have gone far to solve all the economic problems of Russian Poland, and would doubtless have affected powerfully Polish political development. But the population has not remained stationary. It is calculated that in the hundred years of Russian rule from 1816 to 1917 the population increased by 481 per cent. Russian Poland is now by far the most densely populated region of Eastern Europe. Whereas in Prussian Poland the number of inhabitants per square kilometre is about 72, in Russian Poland it is 110, a figure only short by five of that for the whole of Prussia. In the first generation after the Russian agrarian reforms the peasant holdings had been divided up to the extreme minimum limit (8½ acres) allowed by the law, and there had come into existence a body of landless labourers, who at the beginning of the present century already amounted to nearly 1,500,000, or approximately one-half of the entire agricultural population. The sequel to this development has been on the one hand an emigration, which averaged annually as much as 3 per cent. of the total population, and on the other hand a steady flow of the rural population into the towns.

Further subdivision of the large estates and Crown lands, though it undoubtedly ought to be undertaken and at once, cannot do much more than ease the acuteness of the agrarian trouble. The only remedy which can touch the root of the disease is an improvement in the methods of cultivation. Some of the large estates are managed on modern lines; but in the judgment of every expert who has made a study of it the peasant cultivation is, as compared with the peasant cultivation of Prussian Poland, backward and wasteful. Holdings, which under the present system are too small to support a family, can be made to do so with intensive cultivation. But the moment one speaks of improved agricultural methods in Poland, one finds oneself confronted by the two great obstacles to Polish progress, each of them a legacy of Russian misrule, in the first place defective education, in the second place inadequate communications. The number of illiterates in Russian Poland, according to the last census taken before the War, was 62 per cent. of the population. In Warsaw and Lodz, the two chief cities and the centres of Polish industry, the figures were 41.7 and 55 respectively. These are staggering figures. The economic conditions which they indicate must for long act as a dead weight retarding Polish progress. Nothing is so significant of the economic gulf between the Prussian and the Russian Pole as a comparison of the illiteracy statistics. There are no sane illiterates in Prussian Poland!

One might expect the problem of communications to prove easier of solution than that of the schools. But probably it is the educational problem which will make most appeal to the Polish governing class. The Polish governing class has a noble record in the matter of education. Their first act when the Russian rule was relaxed in the Revolution of 1905 was to found an Association to provide schools by private subscription. This Association was suppressed by the Russian authorities under the Reaction; but with the capture

of Warsaw by the Germans a new network of schools almost at once made its appearance, and in 1916 the Germans re-established the Polish University of Warsaw. In the matter of roads, on the other hand, the average Pole is satisfied with what in France, Germany or England would be considered very little. There is a fatalistic standpoint in Eastern Europe with regard to a road. "Shout to the horses, and if God will we shall get through," is the prevailing attitude. Road-building is, however, an obvious form of relief work at a time of unemployment and distress; and there is no place where it will be more remunerative than in Russian Poland. It was by a large programme of road-building that the Prussians began in the first half of the last century the process of building up the economic life of Prussian Poland. As regards railways, the Russian Government after the Japanese War began to double-track a number of the lines in Poland, and the work was nearly completed in 1914. For military reasons, however, no new lines were built, the Russian General Staff having decided in 1911 to withdraw the line of concentration of the Russian armies in the event of war with Germany to the east of the Polish provinces. The waterways of Poland, if they were developed as waterways are developed in Central Europe, might play a part in the future of the country at least as important as the railways. The most obvious need is the canalisation of the Vistula, without which the gift of Danzig—if indeed M. Dmowski has secured that town from the Allies—will be a very imperfect acquisition. At the present time only the German section of the river (Danzig—Nieszawa, 95 miles) can take modern traffic. On the remaining 572 miles of its course (of which 436 miles in Russian Poland, 136 miles in Austrian Poland) no boats above 100 tons can reach Warsaw, while above Warsaw the only traffic is timber-rafts. The standard barge on the adjoining waterways of Germany is 400 tons. Connection with the German system has long existed, and the last link in it, the canal which leads through Bromberg to the Oder, has been deepened by the Germans during the war to take the 400 ton boats. The Germans have further completed during the War an alternative mouth to Danzig (opened Sept., 1917) by the canalised Nogat, which flows past Marienwerder into the Frisches Haff, the long lagoon at the head of which is Königsberg. The connection with the Russian rivers is far less satisfactory. The Dnieper and the Vistula are connected, but long stretches of the connecting waterways are incapable of taking modern traffic. With the Dniester there is no connection at all.

Schools, roads, railways and canals will clearly benefit industry no less than agriculture. The industrialisation of Poland will undoubtedly continue. It is indeed in the interests of agriculture that it should continue, for there can be no doubt that otherwise the agrarian problem cannot be solved without increase of emigration or decrease of the birth-rate. The textile industry of Poland, to which the other industries are to a considerable extent subsidiary—the metal industry, for example, is largely occupied with the production of textile machinery—has been built up on the cheap Russian market, and the policy of any future Polish Government will inevitably be to retain that market by a low tariff wall on the Eastern frontier and a high one on the West. It will not be an easy policy to carry through. But the tariff is not the only problem

which Polish industry will have to solve. Social legislation under the Russian rule was both defective and undeveloped. The Lodz industries before the War were carried on under conditions in not a few respects recalling the horrors of Lancashire in the first half of the last century. Low wages, cruel hours, child labour, and laws which treat a strike as a punishable offence, are not willingly abandoned by mill-owners, in Lancashire or in Lodz; and the Polish capitalists are not less powerful, and scarcely less eloquent, in the political life of their country than Bright and his generation in England. Here again the temptation to any Government will be to neglect the internal problem of social reform for the external problem of the tariff. But the demand for the removal of the great evils prevailing will become increasingly insistent with the spread of education amongst the operatives, and Governments will neglect it at their peril. At the present time Bolshevism appears to have surprisingly little hold in Poland. The seceded Left of the Polish Socialist Party (Pilsudski's Party) and the quite separate organisation known as the Social Democratic Party of the Kingdom of Poland and Lithuania are Bolshevik in the wider sense of the word; that is to say, they place the Social Revolution above all National claims. At the moment the indications seem to be that they are losing rather than gaining influence; and for a variety of reasons, of which the strength of the Catholic Church is the chief, Poland is not naturally a favourable soil for Bolshevism. But, where industrial abuses exist, the Social Revolution, whatever may be thought of its crimes and excesses in Russia, will always appeal as a great ideal and a great hope to millions, to whom neither Nationalism nor Democracy offer any prospect of relief. "Bolshevism" has a long course yet to run in Europe, and international repression seems no more likely to succeed in crushing it than it succeeded in crushing the Political Revolution of the nineteenth century.

O. DE L.

SPAIN AND THE ALLIES.

WHEN Spain deliberately chose to remain neutral in the great struggle between Civilisation and Brutality, it is to be presumed that she counted the cost. She gained certain advantages and she forfeited certain advantages. The relations between her and the Allies during the months immediately following the war cannot be on quite the same footing as those of the Allies among themselves. But it is to the advantage of the Allies no less than of Spain that they should understand the Spanish point of view. It may certainly be maintained that an analysis of the situation of Spain at the beginning of the war and of her action in the war will show that in both respects she stands apart and in a different category from other neutral States.

In the first place, we must always remember that public opinion in Spain rather resembles a fine old galleon of the 16th century than a swift modern cruiser. A single instance of what is meant may be given. If you look at Madrid and Salamanca on the map, to go to Salamanca from the Spanish capital may seem much like a run down to Oxford from Paddington. As a matter of fact it requires a day's journey, and the Madrid newspapers are only on sale in the University town on the following day. If we add to this slowness of communications the extraordinarily marked differences of race and character, outlook and interests between the various provinces of Spain—Galicia, the Basque Provinces, Catalonia, Andalucia, Castille—we can realise at once how difficult it is to move public opinion as a whole unless the interests of Spain as a whole are affected in such a way as to bring the fact home to every Spaniard in the Peninsula, *e.g.*, the Napoleonic invasion. What we often believe to be public opinion in Spain is but that of a small and noisy minority in some large town. The sinking by U-boats only affected the coast cities.

There is, however, one respect in which the great majority of Spaniards through Spain are united. They are all, either as a matter of form or of intense conviction, Roman Catholics. But it so happened that before the war the governments of both of Spain's neighbours, France and Portugal, were intensely anticlerical. In Portugal, moreover, during four years the successful revolutionaries had undermined the discipline of the army and of society to an extraordinary degree, and it was these revolutionaries who were advertising themselves as the only friends of the Allies in Portugal and who were secretly and actively encouraging the Spanish revolutionaries. Those who knew Spain well realised that it would take little short of a miracle to move her from her neutrality. For to add to all the elements militating against Spain's intervention, the statesmen of the Allies insisted on declaring that the Allies were fighting not for their liberty or their existence—that the Spanish people with their memories of the Peninsular War would have readily understood—but for vague ideals, liberty in the abstract, democracy.

In actual life there is no people more nobly democratic than the Spanish—the relation between the classes is an ever fresh and unceasing pleasure to foreigners coming from more "civilised" countries—but the Spaniard does not interest himself overmuch in

abstract questions, and must infallibly remain untouched by what, as the Allies themselves have come to admit, was often political claptrap of a very false and injurious kind. We may take the portrait of a provincial *hidalgo* drawn by that great novelist Pereda as a good likeness of Spain. Readers of *Don Gonzalo González de la Gonzalera* (and be it observed that the suffering and distress brought to the village of Coteruco by the revolutionary politicians described with such acerbity by Pereda are now again being prepared for Spain as a whole by men of the same stamp) recall the figure of this *hidalgo*, a man of strong, noble and humane character, but difficult and unbending. He hurls himself into a rushing river to rescue a boy from drowning. Still in his dripping clothes, he meets the child's mother, who begins to pour forth her gratitude. Thereupon he denies all knowledge of the matter and adds that it would be perfectly indifferent to him if all the village children were drowned to-morrow. He may be said to be typical of Spain with her warm heart and her idealism in action, as opposed to idealism in abstraction. She is like the son in the Bible who said, "I go not," and went. She said to the Allies, "I will not join you," but she took many opportunities of doing service to the Allies. The Spaniards are idealists, but only by virtue of a higher realism which makes the unseen world intensely real and living to them. We see this in the mystic visions of San Juan de la Cruz, in the cynical dreams of Quevedo, in the idealism of Don Quixote. To him the giants of his imagination were as real—for was he not clutched in their arms and bathed in their blood?—as to Sancho's duller sight they were but windmills and wineskins.

A further reason for the non-intervention of Spain in the war was the fact that the Spanish were themselves convinced that neither their Army nor their Navy were of force sufficient to have any real weight. The Spanish soldier, capable of great heroism in African border fighting and yielding to none in power of endurance, is apt to be rendered helpless by the character of modern warfare. Indeed, curiously enough, it was not any lack of humanity nor indifference to German outrages that kept Spain from belligerence, but that essential humanity which places the Spaniard, most especially the Castilian, on a footing of apparent inferiority in mechanical war as in mechanical civilisation. But if it was perfectly obvious that official Spain would remain neutral and in so doing would have the support of the Spanish people, it must not be imagined that Spain did not contain among all classes and professions a large number of ardent pro-Allies. They were to be found in the Church and the Army as well as among professors, politicians and business men. In fact the balance was on the side of the Allies. The matter only stopped there because Spain is a disunited nation of individualists.

King Alfonso, of course, did not for a moment conceal his strong sympathy for Great Britain and France, and it was largely by his personal exertions that Spain was able to render continual service to the Allies. If we remember, as we shall, the persistent efforts made by Spain to serve Nurse Cavell and the great work done by King Alfonso in tracing British prisoners, it is probable that he will be not less popular in England than he was at the

time of his marriage to a British Princess. Europe has no more democratic or progressive sovereign. Yet now a fresh attempt is being made in Spain to overthrow the monarchy and the Republicans have renewed their revolutionary activities. A certain Señor Lerroux goes up and down the country declaring that he will soon be in power in a Spanish Republic. This politician possesses a certain influence at Barcelona and has often encouraged his followers into revolution. At such times Señor Lerroux discreetly retires into obscurity, leaving his foolish victims to be shot down in the street. The mere fact that he is allowed to reappear so soon after an unsuccessful revolution proves the tolerant moderation of the Government. Yet were Señor Lerroux to obtain a momentary success, were he to be in power for six weeks or a couple of months, he would rule only in the name of a small minority, since the vast majority of Spaniards would consider themselves disgraced by such an event. No one is more anxious than the present writer to see reform, progress and liberty in Spain. He would therefore lay the more stress on the fact that, as Spanish revolutionaries have practically admitted to him, Republicanism in Spain is carried on by revolutionary methods instead of by peaceful propaganda within the bounds of law and order because it is a question not of principles but of persons. In other words, the professional politicians who have been agitating Spain and enticing their followers with hopes of office and influence find that their promises lose by long delay and are the more anxious to install themselves in power.

Sincere and patriotic Republicans have one after another recognised that so far as reforms go the Monarchist parties are not less willing to effect them than are the Republicans, and have either retired from politics or joined the Liberal party. Many of the best reforms of recent times have been presented by Don Antonio Maura, who was formerly a Liberal and only went over to the Conservative party because he considered that "liberty has become conservative." It is the revolutionaries and the narrow outlook of Barcelona, Valencia and Bilbao that have been a constant drag on Spain's progress, and have kept her energies fixed on averting civil war instead of furthering civilisation. Let orderly and peaceful Republicanism exist in Spain by all means: it will serve excellently to spur on the Monarchical parties to reform and to prevent excesses in the administration of the country. But so long as in the name of the Republic self-interested politicians continue to resort to revolutionary methods they must bear the full responsibility for keeping Spain a backward country and of being Spain's true reactionaries. Yet after all not the full responsibility, since they are but a small minority, and it is "up to" the Spanish nation to bestir itself and render them harmless.

In Portugal the minority who employ the same revolutionary methods in order to get back into office are most eager to encourage their Spanish colleagues, and would not be sorry to see Spain, their love for which they succeed excellently in dissembling, racked by the throes of a revolution. The late President Sidonio Paes was too clear-sighted a ruler and too sincere a friend of Spain to countenance this international bolshevism. But the other Allies should not overlook the fact that it is partly in their name that

the Spanish revolutionaries are burrowing underground and working in the light of day in order to overthrow order and stable government in Spain. It is not to be thought of that Great Britain should imitate Germany's propaganda in Spain and renounce her policy of not interfering in the internal affairs of other countries, but all the more she should assuredly see to it that her name is not made use of to further unrest in Spain. The revolutionaries are, of course, totally mistaken in thinking that British sympathy is with them, but they are ignorant men, led by the unscrupulous, and will not realise their mistake unless Great Britain and the other Allies prove beyond possibility of misconstruction that they appreciate the services rendered to the Allies during the war by the Spanish Monarchy and share the desire of official Spain to continue on terms of intimate friendship with Great Britain, France and Italy.

It should be realised too that the outcry about the return of Gibraltar to Spain has been almost entirely artificial and was manufactured in Germany. France and Great Britain have a real interest in Spain remaining peaceful and progressive, and Spain has never before had a better prospect of peaceful progress under an enlightened and liberal King and with flourishing finances. But there is also a real danger that the revolutionaries, inspired to fresh efforts by the wonderful success of the red flag in Russia and Germany, may succeed in keeping Spain in a morass of hesitation and strife. Public opinion in the Allied countries can, if it will, save Spain from such a fate. One can only repeat the warning: should the revolutionary politicians obtain power, Spain for five or ten or who knows how many years will be convulsed in civil broils, anarchy and bloodshed. Not Spain only would suffer since Great Britain and Europe may derive much benefit from the reviving Spanish industries. We have perhaps not done them justice in the past. It is not only the raw products of Spain that are excellent. Laments have often been heard in Spain that Spanish articles are continually being sold under foreign trade marks: Galician sardines marked Bordeaux, Andalusian olive-oil sold as Genoese, Spanish mantillas sold as Paris wares, Spanish boots stamped with Vienna's name, and so forth. If injurious to Spanish interests, this is flattering to Spanish manufacturers. And the appreciation is deserved, for if the war has taught us to value essential things—as bread that nourishes rather than bread that looks smooth and white—nowhere in Europe are more solid and lasting goods—in leather, wood, iron, earthenware, basketwork, etc., etc.—turned out than in Spain. Intellectually she offers one of the most beautiful of languages—one of the languages most essential to commerce in South America, and a literature scarcely inferior to any in Europe. Spain has lagged behind modern civilisation, but she has maintained a civilisation of her own, in literature and art and in life, and it would be ten times folly if Englishmen, through failing to understand Spain's characteristically independent but certainly not ignoble attitude in the war or by persisting in their marvellous ignorance of things Spanish, were to cut themselves off from sympathy with a country which can offer much that is nowhere else to be found in Europe.

There has always been a chance and a hope that King

Alfonso XIII's reign might be a great age in Spanish history. In literature, art and science Spain's achievement during this reign has already been exceptional, and the material progress in the great cities and in industry and finance has been equally remarkable. We need not pause to examine how it comes about that all this advance has been possible in a country which, the revolutionaries would have us believe, is a benighted, obscurantist, tyranny-ridden prison-house, or how it is that many of the Spaniards who have attained rank, wealth and influence during the last quarter of a century have been men of humble origin who have won their way to the front by their talents. We see Spain with a capital monthly renewing itself in splendid avenues and buildings, electricity in every town and village, Barcelona, Bilbao, Valencia, flourishing as they have never before flourished, manufactures developing, agriculture likewise, though more slowly, letters and art held in high honour. In fact all Spain's problems would seem to be in fair way of solution were it not for the army of professional soldiers who create an additional and more difficult, viz. the social problem. No doubt there is scope for reform in the Church and in the Administration, and it is very necessary that neither the Army proper nor the civilian army of workmen in the towns should arrogate to itself the right of tyrannising over the Government. Especially it is essential that the bolshevists should not be suffered to defile and destroy by their peculiar mixture of sentimentalism and bloodshed the promise—and it has never been fairer—of a splendid new era under a King whose qualities of courage and sincerity have endeared him to the great mass of the people in Spain and elsewhere.

AUBREY F. G. BELL.

DOMESTIC IDIOCIES.

A GREAT many new houses are going to be built and are, it is understood, actually being designed. But, unless these new houses diverge considerably, both in plan and construction, from the immense majority of houses now existing, they will assuredly create—as these do—much unnecessary toil. It is a sad fact that there are hardly any houses in this country which are not, in one way or another, glaringly inconvenient; and in nine cases out of ten the inconvenience is due not at all to a desire for cheapness but to a misplaced docility, which accepts things as it finds them, and to a lack of familiarity with the processes of domestic work. The house in which I live, for example, was chosen, after an inspection of nearly two hundred dwellings, mainly because domestic idiocies were fewer in it than in most of the others. Yet it has not one room, nor passage, nor stairway, which does not cry out for alterations that would save time and labour; and every one of these alterations would—to my taste, at least—be an improvement in appearance as well as in comfort.

Leaving aside external construction, let us consider first the general features, and afterwards the particular rooms of a house, noting at every step the stupidities encountered.

Doorsteps and Window-sills. Doorsteps and window-sills are still made more frequently of porous stone than of any other material, and convention forbids the leaving of these slabs to become, as they naturally would, blackened or greenish from the effects of time and weather. People should, of course, be brave enough to disregard the convention; but servants, although they hate “doing the step,” hate still more to fall below the current standard. So hearthstone and wet rag are daily applied to produce a radiance which will be sullied by the first footfall and destroyed by the first shower. Obviously, external steps and sills should be made of some material that can be cleaned by the mere use of water and a stiff broom; bricks, for instance, or terra-cotta, or marble.

Doors. In nine cases out of ten front doors display brass fittings, which, in this climate, can be kept bright only by continual polishing. Moreover, as doors are generally painted, and metal-polish naturally removes paint, bells, knockers and letter-boxes become surrounded by haloes of discoloration. Thus upon doors and doorsteps alone there is an incessant expenditure of labour—to say nothing of hearthstone and polish—solely because architects and builders have the habit of using materials in the wrong places. House doors are generally placed in the plane of the front wall, so that their opening both reveals the interior and admits a draught. Even where a projecting porch affords an easy opportunity for the sideways setting of the door, that opportunity is seldom used. The reason assigned for the ordinary arrangement is that it facilitates the carrying out of coffins; but, surely, when the vast total of comings and goings in each lifetime is compared with the single final exit, this reason will be held inadequate. Back doors should not be situated, as they often are, beyond the kitchen window, through which the back-entry prowler can discover, before reaching the door, whether the room is empty. Many a silver spoon has

disappeared untraceably owing to the chance thus offered by the architect.

The placing, indeed, of all doors demands careful thought; and the rule laid down in some architectural handbooks of so hanging the door that it will not, when opened, display the room, is by no means sound. The point to be considered is the convenience of the persons who will have to pass in and out. A dining-room door, for instance, which has to be circumnavigated by the servant who brings in a tray is a daily source of irritation, as well as a danger to crockery. If there *must* be a general rule, the safest would be that a door should always open back against a wall, since that position facilitates entry and exit. But the only true rule is to consider carefully how each room will have to be used and furnished, remembering always that a lane between an open door and a wall is not a convenient form of access. Whether well or ill placed, doors are almost invariably ill designed. Their panels are enclosed by sharply cornered and finely grooved mouldings, and their frames, adorned with similar mouldings, project from the wall. All these surfaces catch and retain dust, to dislodge which is a work of more time and patience than most people are willing to devote to so dull a job. Corrugations should be replaced by a single, hollow curve, corners should change into curves and the frames of doors should cease to project. Or, indeed, the panels should disappear altogether, and doors should offer a plain, smooth surface. But perhaps so complete a simplification would appear to many people too revolutionary. The need of reforming dust-retaining shapes is widely recognised, but they continue to be reproduced because of the existence of the standard pattern. Timber is imported ready cut into miles of machine mouldings, the machinery being arranged (not of malice prepense, but through sheer ignorance and lack of reflection) to produce all these grooves and projections by which we are surrounded and which we find so difficult to keep clean. Standard patterns evidently need to be revised in the light of reason and of knowledge.

Windows. The frames of windows, like those of doors, should cease to project from the walls; window bars should cease to have machine-made corrugations, and should be rounded; while the windows themselves should be carried to the ceiling, partly because the highest panes admit most light and partly because stale air stagnates above the level at which fresh air is admitted. In design windows ought to be so altered that they can be easily and safely cleaned. If sashes are retained they should return to their original design, in which one inner section of the frame was removable and only held in place by a thumb-screw. The actual window can thus be drawn inwards, and both sides of the panes cleaned from within the room. One such window at least still exists—in York Buildings, Adelphi, where the process of its cleaning may from time to time be observed. If casement windows are used they should, in the interests of convenience, open inwards; the outward opening casement is often even more difficult to clean than the modern sash window. And is it not really an idiocy to build windows in such a way that they cannot be cleaned except by the employment of an extraneous man with a ladder?

To put a skylight where it cannot be cleaned (even with the aid of a man and a ladder) is stupid; to put it where it cannot be screened is, in days of aerial attack, dangerous. My own abode contains a skylight placed high up the sharp slope of the roof, far beyond the range of any Turk's head broom, beyond the range, even, of any ordinarily long ladder, and, moreover, so situated in relation to the well of the staircase that a ladder could hardly be placed to approach it. It cannot possibly be opened, nor cleaned, nor shaded. As the house stands in a short double row of semi-detached villas, all with similar skylights, the appearance from above, on winter evenings, must be very much that of a large factory in full work.

Blinds. Venetian blinds, sensible things enough in themselves, are transformed into idiocies by the manner in which they are fixed. In the house of my childhood, and, I believe, in all houses of that period, these blinds were hung across a pair of projecting brackets from which they could be lifted down for cleaning or for the repair of a broken cord. It is true that the brackets had not always, as of course they ought to have had, turned-up ends, which would have prevented the suspended bar from slipping off, and that a blind did, therefore, from time to time fall upon somebody's head. But the proper remedy to apply was an alteration of the brackets. The blind firmly screwed through its top lath to the window-frame—the blind that can never be removed except by a carpenter—is an offence to the cleanly instincts of a housewife. It is now many years since I have seen a Venetian blind hung in any other manner. From the housewife's point of view, and probably from the artist's, outside shutters formed of slanted slats are more satisfactory than inner blinds. They are more durable, easier to clean, and apply the desired shade where it should be applied, outside, instead of inside, the heated glass.

Floors. The difficulty of making a floor-surface that shall be (a) germ-proof; (b) warm to the foot; (c) not noisy to the tread; (d) not prohibitive in price, has apparently not yet found a solution. One thing, at least, is certain, *i.e.*, that wood fails to fulfil the first condition; it does, almost certainly, retain germs and does, unquestionably, house insects; while, if uncovered, it is noisy when walked upon. So, as far as I can discover, is every kind of concrete, and the latter seems to be also colder than wood. Both warmth and noisiness, of course, depend not only upon the nature of the surface but also upon the substructure; and if the desired qualities can be secured only by an expensive method of construction, the surface itself may be considered as too costly. Linoleum, if kept clean (that is, not washed—still less scrubbed, but swept and lightly oiled) does resist insects and probably germs, but is both cold and noisy. To me its surface appears hideous. Cork carpet, on the other hand, is by no means hideous; is neither cold nor noisy, and if properly cared for (*i.e.*, treated like linoleum) lasts long and preserves its good appearance. But at present it is extremely dear. All woollen floor coverings are warm and silent, but all, in their degree, insani-tary—and they, too, have become very expensive. We end as we began; there is an unsolved problem. He who discovers a satisfactory solution will be a public benefactor on a large scale; and

—if he succeeds in evading exploitation—probably also a millionaire.

Passages and Stairs. Of passages and stairs the less a house can manage to have the better. Every foot of floor that might be part of a room and is part of a passage means a waste of space and an increase of expense and labour. Passages require sweeping more frequently than rooms, their coverings wear out more quickly, and their extent contributes in no degree—as the extent of a room does—to the comfort of a house's inhabitants. To stairs these statements apply even more emphatically, because domestic fatigue is so largely a matter of going up and down stairs, and because stair carpets wear out even more rapidly than the carpets of passages. Upon the plan and position of the staircase largely depends the length of the necessary passages; where the staircase issues upon a central landing all, or nearly all, the upper rooms may open directly from this; but where the staircase emerges at one side of the house a passage must run almost all across it, and the rooms must be correspondingly diminished. There are houses—and fairly modern houses, too—in which as many square feet are wasted in passages as would have enabled a more resourceful designer to put another good-sized room upon the site.

Balusters should be, and seldom are, plain and preferably round. Every divergence from that pattern makes them more difficult to dust, and is therefore an offence against cleanliness. Here, as in most cases, good taste is at one with good sense. Anybody familiar with the slim, undecorated shafts that run up, emphasising the construction and the perspective, beneath the handrail of many an eighteenth-century house, will feel that their refined simplicity makes our elaborate balusters (in my own there are twenty-two variations of plane) look vulgar.

Bells. The electric bell is one of humanity's false starts and is altogether inferior to the bell upon a wire which it has so inexplicably superseded. Electric bells are nervous creatures, not only quite unfit for intercourse with errand boys, who, by keeping a finger on the push until the door opens, speedily render them mute, but also liable to atmospheric disturbance. I have known a front door bell, on a thunderous afternoon, ring of its own accord at intervals of a few minutes, for a couple of hours on end. A more distracting performance cannot be conceived. And suppose that fit of hysterics had occurred during the night. The wire-hung bells of my childhood neither rang when nobody set them in motion nor failed to do so when somebody did. Moreover, on the comparatively rare occasions when they got out of order, they proclaimed the fact by emitting a length of wire with the bell-pull, whereas that hypocrite, the electric bell, simply holds its tongue and makes no sign. Of the further inconveniences created by the habit of putting electric batteries in the remotest and least accessible positions I do not speak, since that practice is not an instance of idiocy, but of malice aforethought, designed to secure the intervention of a man and a bill. Still, it is one that should be sternly repressed.

Kitchens. The ordinary kitchen range: "that hideous, funereal, inconvenient appliance," as Lady Frazer calls it, possesses as many

faults and as few virtues as any contrivance yet devised by man. Even in a small household under the superintendence of a frugal mistress it will cheerfully eat up its ton of coal a month; if it is to burn properly, it will require daily cleaning of the flues—and only those who have themselves performed it know how unpleasant the process is. Servants of course evade it; and then ovens refuse to bake and baths know no interval of warmth. Indeed, at the best of times, the expectation of deriving from the kitchen range any ample supply of hot water in the bathroom is little better than an illusion. Finally, the kitchen range produces smoke and soot in great abundance, and demands an unreasonable amount of professional chimney-sweeping as well as an inordinate deal of black-leading. The instrument for cooking our daily meals should really be less troublesome and expensive. Bad as it thus intrinsically is, a range is usually made worse by being set in an artificial cavern where twilight reigns even at noonday. Nobody can easily see whether or when a pot boils, and to cook upon a stove so placed is a constant strain upon the attention, the back-bone and the eyesight. The American stove, standing out into the open upon legs high enough to admit a broom beneath it is cleaner and less troublesome. An anthracite kitchen stove needs no relighting and no cleaning of flues, will keep plenty of water really hot and supply heat to as many as three radiators in other parts of the house. In a small house it would almost heat every room day and night. Such a range is supposed to consume half a ton of anthracite monthly, but in private use appears always to need rather more. As warm baths are wanted all the year, while to keep any range going through the dog-days renders the kitchen intolerable, every house should have a gas or electric supply for alternative cooking.

Of kitchen dressers the top shelf is a mere absurdity; only a giantess could make habitual use of it. Dressers should be longer and lower, and the distance between one shelf and the next should be no greater than is necessary for the comfortable lifting in and out of plates without danger to suspended cups or jugs. If dressers were lower, and if their top shelf were as wide again as those below it—which would thus be screened by it from dust—a handy place would be provided where such things as fireproof casseroles might be kept apart from saucepans. On the other hand, the drawers and cupboards of most dressers are too deep. Small articles are more conveniently housed in rather shallow drawers; and the back portion of deep cupboards is always dark. Shallow cupboards and many of them is the right prescription for the kitchen.

Larders. It is bad to make a larder window face south, east or west (unless indeed a continual shadow falls on it); but it is worse to leave a larder windowless. Neither defect is uncommon. Where difficulties of plan make a sunny aspect unavoidable there should be an outside shutter provided. Some panes of every larder window should be made of perforated zinc or of wire gauze, so that flies may be kept out while air is admitted.

Sculleries. The maxim, "no dark corners"—applicable to all parts of all houses—should be applied with especial rigour to places where food and feeding vessels are to be handled. A dark

kitchen, a dark scullery, a washing-up sink placed away from direct light, these are unpardonable idiocies: sins against the very spirit of cleanliness. To set a sink in a dark corner is to invite—among other worse things—the breakage of crockery; yet early Victorian architects seem to have regarded a dark corner as *the* place for a sink; and although their successors, in building for well-to-do people, seldom commit this error, I have seen it in many fairly recent plans for cottages. A corner, even if well lighted, can furnish a suitable place for a sink only when a shelf or table can be arranged along each of the two walls, so as to give ample space within reach for the assembling of washed and unwashed dishes. I have lived in a house where the washed crockery used to be—and almost had to be—ranged upon the three brick steps that led up from the scullery to the kitchen. The famous Staines sinks, excellent, but dear, and open below as every sink should be, are fitted with shelves both on the level and below. In these days sinks are generally made of earthenware, a clean material, but one against the hard surface of which china easily chips. They are apt to be shallow and their gratings of outlet can seldom be closed. Sinks of a superior pattern do, however, exist (the L.C.C. puts them into its tenements) and should be provided in all new dwellings. These, being deep and possessing stoppers, are available for washing-up without the intervention of a basin, or for overnight soaking of small articles for the weekly wash. The sink, in short, becomes also a particularly good sort of self-emptying tub, and much lifting and pouring away of water is saved. I do not recollect whether the L.C.C. sinks that I have seen are deformed by the usual external indentations, as of a hollowed-out finger-mark, that seem actually designed to retain grease or dirty water. The standard pattern again! No doubt, if one insisted upon a smooth-outside sink, one would have to pay extra for it. Yet when—if ever—good sense dictates the forms of manufactured articles, there will assuredly be no more patterns upon sinks.

The history of plate racks is instructive. In my girlhood all houses inhabited by people of the middle class had copious plate-racks affixed to their scullery walls. In the intention, no doubt, of preserving the floor from drippings, these were habitually placed immediately over the sink, the edge of which, generally wet, consequently rubbed against the skirt or apron of any woman who reached up to place or withdraw a plate. Moreover, I well remember hearing my mother remark that she had never seen a plate-rack hung comfortably within the reach of an ordinary woman. The fixing was, of course, done by workmen who chose, irreflectively but unanimously, a height convenient to themselves. What ensued? Servants, finding the racks inconvenient, naturally did not make use of them, and landlords learned to omit the fixture. At a later period somebody, rediscovering the fact that trouble might be saved by setting washed plates to dry of themselves, began to make portable racks, which are found useful. The time is surely ripe for the reappearance of the fixed plate-rack—but it must be hung with its top no higher than $5\frac{1}{2}$ feet from the floor, and there should be a little tray or a grating below to receive its drippings.

A tendency—which should be discouraged—may be observed to omit coppers from modern middle-class houses. A copper is useful for many purposes even when washing is not done at home, and at seasons of house-cleaning is quite invaluable. Where, as in almost all working-class homes, women wash their clothes at home, a copper should be provided as invariably as a roof, and it should always have a supply tap above it and an outlet tap at its base, the latter being over a grating and waste-pipe. The copper itself should be made to lift out of its setting for the occasional cleaning of flues. Incredible as it may appear, coppers are not infrequently built into scullery walls in such a manner that part of the wall has to be pulled down and rebuilt at every sweeping of the flues; nay, this idiotic arrangement actually exists in modern “garden” settlements where the houses profess to be models of enlightened building.

Bedrooms. On our way from the scullery to the sleeping rooms let us consider, in passing, what is, perhaps, the commonest of domestic idiocies. We shall not see it; concealment is its very essence. It is that arrangement by which the water pipes, gas pipes and electric wires, the internal organs of a house in short, are carried up inside the structure of its walls instead of being enclosed, as they might be, and occasionally are, in a recess or cupboard that runs up the house from floor to floor, and is enclosed on each storey by a neat cover of wood, the catches of which can be loosened at any moment and the cupboard laid bare whenever repairs become necessary. In a land where water-pipes are apt to break at the most wretched and uncomfortable seasons we might at least facilitate access to them so that they can easily be mended.

So to plan a bedroom that no bed can conveniently stand in it is, it will be admitted, an idiocy. Some architects, anxious to avoid this folly, show upon the plan of each bedroom the outline of a bed; and it is to be wished that all the rest would follow their example. I have seen rooms in which a full-sized bed could not possibly stand without running across the fireplace; and have slept in a bed standing (and no other position was possible for it) immediately under and parallel with a wide window—the only one and necessarily entirely shut during rain. A heavy sleeper might easily be drenched by a sudden downpour; and it was not safe to leave the window open while the inhabitants of the house were out.

The growing fashion of having fitted furniture, designed for and with the house, must demand from architects a consideration of our needs which hitherto has not always been forthcoming; and it may be hoped that no essential piece of furniture will either be crowded out or driven into a thoroughly awkward position. But the hope is somewhat dashed by recollection of the stupidly planned cupboards so prevalent in bedrooms. Ninety-nine in every hundred are carried somewhat higher than an ordinary wardrobe, but not to the ceiling. The top being high up and set, moreover, in a recess is, practically speaking, out of dusting range: is, in short, a shelf that cannot be kept clean. Such a shelf ought to be enclosed by a framework reaching to the ceiling, and by a door. The subsidiary cupboard thus formed would be a handy receptacle for articles needing to be preserved, yet out of daily use; but even if left per-

manently empty its existence would remove from somebody's sleeping room a convenient nesting place for germs.

Bathrooms. The very silliest feature of bathrooms—the built-in bath—is happily obsolescent; but the bath that stands out by no means yet stands out enough. Until it is so placed that a broom or a vacuum cleaner can be conveniently passed round and beneath every portion of it, its position will remain, in some measure, idiotic. Taps are among the most irritating of inanimate objects; and the correction of their incessant demands for new washers is apparently beyond the present power of the human brain. In America, I understand, bath water is turned on, not by a tap, but by a wrench, and the supply pipes are so large that a bath fills very rapidly, and can be cleaned out by merely allowing the water to rush, swirling, through it. Perhaps some day Great Britain may have baths of this kind. Meanwhile taps continue to exist, and to be made of brass, so that they are tarnished by the steam of the first bath and cannot be kept bright even by daily polishing. And as though this circumstance were not sufficiently tiresome, most workmen fix the taps so close to the wall or woodwork from which they project that it is impossible either comfortably to pass a duster behind them or to fill a jug from them.

Fixed washing basins often display some ornament protruding, like a pent-house, over the inflow-holes. The aim (which, however, is not achieved) is to prevent the person who draws the water from getting splashed; the result is to hinder, very effectually, the proper cleaning of that part of the basin. The wise designer will insist upon unadorned basins and earn thereby the gratitude of countless women. Nearly all self-emptying basins and sinks have below them what are known as S traps; the pipe, that is to say, takes a downward and then an upward curve, the theory being that water will lie in the lower bend and form a barrier against the rising of noxious gases. Of course the water that repes in the bend is not clean, and of course, solid matter—soap and grease—also accumulates and, if not removed, decays. In order to allow of cleaning the pipe should, and often does, have a screwed-in stopper at its lowest point. To remove this is at all times a difficult and ticklish job; the screw must be tight and strong or there would be leakage; its situation under the sink or basin necessitates a kneeling or crouching posture accompanied by an upward gaze; and as soon as the screw relapses an incredibly filthy fluid comes filtering through. Of course, a receptacle of some sort must be ready to catch it, “But,” as a long-suffering housewife writes, “*as a rule* the wary plumber puts the screw *very* close to a wall and makes the up-bend stand in *front* of it so that one cannot see or get at what one has to do, and *no* vessel will stand round behind it, owing to the wall.” Furthermore, whenever the pipe is painted, the painter applies a good, thick coat all over the screw, and renders it thereby perfectly immovable. By such methods as these is the superior intelligence of men impressed upon the housekeeping sex.

One other egregious folly prevails in the bathroom—the folly of including in it another indispensable apartment which ought to be isolated. A moment's reflection will show that to throw into one two rooms, neither of which can be occupied by more than one

person at a time is to halve the availability of both. The design is not, therefore, as some architects seem to suppose, economical; but, on the contrary, wastes and has wasted much time, comfort and even health in numbers of rather crowded households. It ought to be prohibited by sanitary authorities.

Finally, in no house should it be necessary to go into the garden or the street in order to turn off the water supply, nor should the instrument for turning it off be more complicated than an ordinary tap. Any person who has—as I have—been deluged with freshly thawed water in endeavouring to stop the rush from a burst pipe will not think the point unworthy of consideration.

This brief review of domestic idiocies is far from being exhaustive. It includes none that has not been repeatedly observed and excludes several that have been noted but once or twice. Taken as a whole the list exhibits the triumph of blind imitation over first-hand observation and reflection: the triumph, in short, of stupidity in one of the commonest and most useful departments of human industry. Is it too much to hope that in the interval before the erecting of hundreds and thousands of new houses there may be such consideration of what saves labour, as distinguished from what wastes it, and such consultation of intelligent people as may eliminate all such domestic idiocies as now exist and prevent the creation of new ones?

CLEMENTINA BLACK.

THE EARLIEST SURVIVING BOOK OF A BRITISH AUTHOR.

IF you were to put the question to an educated audience, "What is the earliest surviving book by a British author?" you might get various answers. Some might refer to Beowulf, others to Caedmon: but there is only one true answer, as is admitted by the *Cambridge History of English Literature*, and that is, Pelagius' Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul. That there should be any doubt felt on such a matter is symptomatic of a grave British defect, our neglect of, and lack of interest in, our own old literature. It would be hard to name another great people so reckless of all that pertains to its own oldest history. It was not till recently that the protection of our old architectural monuments was taken up as a national matter, and it is high time that a similar care should be devoted to our oldest literary monuments. It is not creditable to us that if we want to read, for example, the historical work of Gildas of Bath, belonging to the sixth century, or the chronological work of the Venerable Bede, belonging to the first third of the eighth, we must have recourse to editions by the German scholar, Mommsen. Again, while it is true that the best edition of Bede's Ecclesiastical History is by an Englishman, for almost all his other works we have to depend on the careless edition of Dr. J. A. Giles, published over seventy years ago. To take one illustration of its character: Giles, a graduate of Oxford, puts himself to the trouble to enumerate certain late Paris manuscripts of Bede on the Catholic Epistles, but is blind to the existence of two far older ones in his own university, by means of which his text can be improved in about a dozen places per page. There are several reputations waiting to be made, and easily made, too, by worthy editors of the voluminous works of Bede, who was not only pre-eminent for holiness, but the greatest author of his day in Europe. Manuscripts of his works are to be found in practically every old library, attesting his great fame.

There is only one class in the community capable of undertaking work like this. Though the subject matter of most of these early works is biblical or theological, hardly any of our clergy have the time, inclination, or even competence for the task. Their time is occupied, and rightly occupied, with the cure of souls on the one hand, and the reconstruction of theology on the other. We may hope that the best educated of them will read such works when they are made accessible to them, but it is another class that must make them accessible, and that is the class of trained Latinists. These Latinists must pass through the severe discipline of a classical training, and must also become competent in the reading of Latin manuscripts. They must at the same time be something of textual critics, and they must know the Latin Bible. It seems to me that this is one of the ways in which our students may do something to repay the debt they owe to their schools and universities: "Freely ye have received, freely give." Enthusiasm and a trained faculty of observation are the prime requisites for the work.

Even if our early books were not of such value in themselves,

it would still be our duty, because they are ours, and because they are early, to make them as widely accessible as possible in the most accurate form possible. It happens, however, that the work with which I am here concerned is one of real importance, an importance derived in part from its subject.

It is a matter of continual surprise to me that St. Paul has not yet received among us the place which is his due. It is clear from the New Testament records, whose authenticity is now much more widely and strongly accepted than was the case say fifty to eighty years ago, that Our Lord, while He had an ultimate mission to the world as a whole, was self-limited in this as well as other respects, that *He* could present his message only to His own race. He knew Himself, by this self-limitation, competent to teach Jews only. The wider mission was entrusted by Him especially to one who had the best Jewish and *Gentile* education, and the social position which Roman citizenship gave. "East is East, and West is West, and never they twain shall meet"; except perhaps in the mind and heart of one who has early learnt to know and love both. The teaching of Jesus cannot be fully understood by a Western, its dress is so thoroughly Eastern. If Christianity was to come to the West, it must come in a dress recognisable by the West. The divinely appointed St. Paul provided this. *His words are the words of Christ Himself* to the Western world, to which we ourselves belong. It seems to me, therefore, that from these considerations it results that the epistles of St. Paul are of all books in the world the most valuable: and from this it follows that every serious attempt to explain them is a work of importance.

Britain was invaded by Julius Cæsar in 55 and 54 B.C., but did not become a part of the Roman Empire till about the middle of the first century of our era. At that time the usual process of Romanisation commenced, and there can be no doubt that it developed in the three and a half centuries during which Britain remained a part of the Roman Empire, especially in the non-mountainous parts of the country lying south of the Forth and Clyde, but particularly those south of the Tyne and Solway line. Romanisation in a Western province meant among other things the spread of the Latin language, in the cities at least. Mayor's copious note on Juvenal, *Satires* xv., III, shows that in the neighbouring Gaul, where the Roman dominion was about a century older, there were many centres of Roman higher education, and there Juvenal says that "eloquent Gaul has taught the British pleaders," and that "Thyle—wherever that may have been—is speaking about engaging the services of a professor of the art of public speaking." About Juvenal's period, early in the second century, we have references in other authors also to British higher education, and there can be no doubt that this education extended during the following centuries, though our records are very scanty.

At what date Christianity was introduced into our country, it is not possible to say exactly. A date in the first century is not impossible, and it is quite certain that by the second century the new religion had obtained a footing: for various second century writers proclaim that Christianity has spread over the whole Roman world, and Britain is specially mentioned by Tertullian about the

year 200 as converted, even in its non-Roman parts. The presence of a flourishing Christianity in the third and fourth centuries is adequately attested by the documents collected in the first volume of Haddan and Stubbs' "*Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents.*" There is also an extreme probability that the new religion had spread to Ireland as well, though that island was never under the Roman dominion. From this rapid survey of educational and religious life in the British Isles, it will be seen that they were ripe for the production of a great author; and such an author was, as a matter of fact, produced.

Pelagius is spoken of by some contemporaries as a native of Britain, by others as Irish. It is difficult to decide which is the true account. The term Irish may have been attached to him out of contempt, as at that period the Irish barbarians were despised by the Romans. Yet it is something of an argument in favour of Irish origin, that the Irish Church afterwards held Pelagius' name and work in great reverence. But the high standard of education evidenced by his works rather favours a British origin. Professor Bury would reconcile the two views by making him one of an Irish colony settled in Southern Wales, Somerset or Devon. The date of his birth is uncertain, and the only considerations which help us to fix it are two: first the clear signs of mature judgment and settled opinion in his commentary, and second, the fact that the contemporaries who engaged in bitter controversy with him never allege his youth against him. It is probable, therefore, that he was born about the middle of the fourth century, in any case not later than 370.

When and why he came to Rome are other mysteries. The general view of critics is that he must have arrived there before the end of the fourth century. From certain passages in his commentary I have ventured a conjecture that he had some sharp disagreement with his father, and was thus led to leave home for Rome, the great centre alike of education and of Christianity. However that may be, we first hear of him at Rome. He appears to have been possessed of private means, for he lived in the capital as a recluse, devoted to study of the Scriptures and of theology. Even his enemies admit that his private life was stainless, and we certainly discover in his works no sign, such as appears in those of Jerome and Augustine, of personal experience of a loose life. His own experience, such as it was, led him to put a high value on human nature in itself, and he found himself in conflict with Augustine's view of Divine Grace. His general attitude appears throughout his commentary on the epistles of St. Paul, completed about 409.

Either before or after the sack of Rome by Alaric in 410, Pelagius found his way to Africa in company with his friend Caelestius. It was there that their views first met with opposition. Caelestius was condemned at Carthage in 411 for denying original sin, and the necessity of infant baptism for salvation. Pelagius afterwards went to Palestine. There he was attacked by the Spaniard Orosius and by Jerome on account of his disrespect for divine grace, but before the synods held at Jerusalem and Diospolis in 415 he was found "not guilty" by the Eastern bishops. As early as 412 Augustine had begun to write against his views,

and down to 418 continued to issue tractates against him which are models of gentlemanly controversy. Before 417, only the North African churches had condemned Pelagianism, and in January 417 Innocent I. of Rome was persuaded by Augustine to take the same step. His successor Zosimus was, however, more lenient. Finally, a general Council held at Carthage in May, 418, condemned Pelagius, and almost simultaneously an imperial edict against him was obtained by Augustine. Both Pelagius and Caelestius thereupon left Rome, and are no more heard of. It is possible that Ireland was their destination, as the Roman legions had been withdrawn from Britain in 406 or 407, and Ireland thus became quite cut off from the Roman Empire.

The commentary was issued, as I have said, in Rome, about the year 409, almost certainly as an anonymous work. Its character is described by two contemporaries, Augustine and Marius Mercator. It came into Augustine's hands in or before 412, and he speaks of it as "certain writings which contain *very brief expositions* of the Epistles of the Apostle Paul." Mercator a few years later says that Pelagius sought "to explain *the words or thoughts of the Apostle one by one.*" From these references it is evident that the expositions bore very much of the character of a glossary. But Augustine and Marius Mercator do not confine themselves to description: they both make quotations from the commentary. The most important of these is given by both of them, and I propose now to present it in English. It is a note on Romans V. and 15, "For if by the trespass of the one the many died, much more did the grace of God, and the gift by the grace of the one man, Jesus Christ, abound unto the many." Pelagius says:—

"Those who are against the view that sin is inherited, endeavour thus to attack it: 'If,' they say, 'the sin of Adam injured even those that do not sin, therefore also the righteousness of Christ benefits even those that do not believe, because Paul says that salvation is brought about similarly, or rather, to a greater degree, by *one*, than destruction was previously brought about by *one*.' Then they say: 'If baptism cleanses away that old sin, the children of two baptised persons must lack present sin: for they could not transmit to posterity that which they themselves did not at all possess. Further, if the soul is not inherited, but only the flesh, the latter alone has the inherited sin, and it alone deserves punishment'; they declare it to be unjust that a soul born to-day, not from the mass of Adam, should carry so ancient a sin which was another's. They say also that it is inadmissible that God, who forgives one's own sins, should charge us with those of another."

It was this passage in particular that roused all the hostility of which Pelagius became the victim.

The quotations which the layman Mercator makes from the commentary are especially important, when we proceed to identify the Pelagius commentary among surviving documents. For he quotes *in extenso* from the commentary on Romans V 12 ff except at one point, where he says he is omitting a few words. This fortunate remark of his enables us to identify the commentary; without it

the task would not have been nearly so easy. The condemnation of Pelagius was so effective that not a single copy of his commentary survives with his name on it. There is reason to suppose that it was not attached to it at the beginning, because it was in extent not very much more than a copy of the Epistles of St. Paul, and the work also appears to have been intended especially for private circulation. Arnobius Junior, a Gallic Latin writer of the middle of the fifth century, quotes part of the above passage from Pelagius, by name.

Though no copy survives with his name on it, it is referred to by *his name* fairly often in the Middle Ages, from about the end of the seventh century, in particular by Irish Latin writers. Side by side with these labelled references, derived presumably from copies bearing the author's name, there existed copies of the commentary, some anonymous, some falsely attributed, and most of them interpolated. In all, the Pelagius commentary has survived in seven or eight forms: (a) the original Biblical text and commentary in a Balliol College MS. (No. 157) under Jerome's name; (b) a partially "vulgarised" Biblical text and the original commentary in an anonymous Karlsruhe MS. (Reichenau, No. 119); (c) a partially "vulgarised" Biblical text and a much expanded form of the commentary, with a good deal of otherwise unknown matter by Pelagius himself and others, in the Paris (Verona) MS. (No. 653); (d) a still more "vulgarised" Biblical text and an expanded form of the commentary, the expansions being for the most part due to another (Pelagian) hand, and very rarely coinciding with those in the Paris MS.—in the St. Gall MS. (No. 73); (e) a form very like the last, but attributed to Jerome, found in a number of MSS.; (f) another form, a good deal shorter than the last, yet related to it, also attributed to Jerome, found in a few MSS., from one of which it was printed by Erasmus in his edition of Jerome in 1516; that form presents about six thousand textual corruptions in this and succeeding editions; (g) Cassiodorus' form, printed under the name of Primasius, in 1537 and since, where a Biblical text of unequal character is given, and where the notes have been definitely re-written, in order to agree with Augustinian, as against Pelagian, teaching. There is also a large amount of subsidiary material in mediæval compilations, belonging particularly to the ninth century.

It is now our duty to examine the author's method, and to give some particulars of his exegesis. The celebrated note quoted by Augustine is not characteristic in respect to length. The usual note is much shorter. Of all the features of the commentary perhaps the most striking is the frequency of alternative explanations, the second being introduced by *sive*. For example, on Rom. iii, 11, "There is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God," the note is: "Because he does not understand, he does not seek." Or, "He does not understand, for the reason that he does not seek. God is sought then, when His will is enquired into, because every one that sinneth hath not seen Him nor known Him, because he who sins has not learnt the will of his Lord. Even in ordinary parlance we speak of a man not being known, when we mean that his will is unknown." Again on I Cor. ii. 7: "(the wisdom) which God fore-

ordained before the worlds," the note is: "Either in foreknowledge, *or* in the law, before time was: for many prophets desired to see, and did not see." Again, at Eph. iii. 1, "I, Paul, the prisoner of Christ Jesus," the note is: "Either bound by chains *or* bound by the love of Christ, I cannot do my own will save it be that of the Lord. Of course when he calls himself a prisoner, he confirms the gospel of Christ, showing how great his hope is in Him, for whom he is joyfully eager to suffer such things, although as a teacher of the law, he could have lived among the Jews in great wealth and high distinction."

Even these few notes will have shown another characteristic, namely, the author's deep knowledge of Scripture. There is much direct quotation from Scripture in proof of his views; there is also much Scripture language interwoven with the texture of the notes. There are about three hundred quotations from, or references to Scripture that are unrecognised by the editors of the False Jerome. Perhaps the most interesting feature of these references is the large number made to the apocryphal book of Ecclesiasticus, the Wisdom of Jesus, the son of Sirach. Pelagius must have known it practically by heart. But there are few Biblical books from which no quotation is made. The Old Testament, of which in all thirty-four books are quoted or alluded to, and also the Gospels and Acts, are quoted from Old Latin, not Vulgate copies. The Catholic epistles are frequently quoted, also according to an Old Latin text. Like other writers, too, Pelagius has his favourite verses, such as First John iii. 2, "it is not yet manifest what we shall be. We know that, if He shall be manifested, we shall be like Him: for we shall see Him even as He is"; or again Acts v. 41 "(the apostles) departed from the presence of the Council, rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer dishonour for the Name." He is fond also of referring to the original charge given to Barnabas and Saul, to the punishment of Ananias and Sapphira, and to Simon Magus. A favourite type of note is that which attempts to make the meaning of St. Paul's words clearer, by pointing out what the Apostle is *not* referring to; the negative method of exegesis, e.g., Rom. v. 9, "In His own Blood," "Not the blood of animals, as in the Old Testament." Tit. i. 1, "Paul the servant of God," "Not of sin." 2 Tim. i. 1, "By the will of God," "Not by my merits."

There are no references *by name* to earlier commentators used by Pelagius in the composition of his commentary. The investigations of Mr. Alfred J. Smith, now being published in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, put it beyond doubt that Ambrosiaster, Augustine, and Origen in Rufinus' translation were all used by the author. Previous investigators have indicated parallels with Greek authorities like Chrysostom. But the author does not appear to have slavishly followed any authority or group of authorities. The references to other writers are veiled under the word *quidam*, "certain persons." He generally rejects the views of these *quidam*, to whom he refers about fifty times.

If space had permitted, I should have liked to illustrate further, especially the constant refutation of heresies in the commentary, rendering Pelagius' excommunication all the more pathetic: but at this point I must end this brief account. The task of the editor

of this commentary has been rendered unduly heavy by the neglect of four centuries. But when it is complete, what is practically a new authority will be put into the hands of Latin scholars, New Testament textual critics and exegetes and theologians. It will be possible to amplify our Latin dictionaries and grammars, and to write a new chapter in the history of Latin style. At the same time there will be provided a new authority for the text of the Greek New Testament. It will be of even more value for the unfolding of the history of the Latin New Testament. Besides the text as used by Pelagius himself, various other strata will be revealed, which if I mistake not will shed a flood of light on the character and development of the Latin text of the Epistles during the early Middle Ages.

It would perhaps be hardly wrong to say that the Latin Vulgate has exercised more influence than any other book, and any evidence which amplifies or renders more precise the work so exquisitely performed by Samuel Berger, ought to be welcome, particularly to those Benedictines who under the direction of Cardinal Gasquet are at present engaged in preparing a new edition of the Vulgate for the Roman Church. There are also a good many quotations from the Old Latin of the Old Testament, not one of which is given in Sabatier's great collection. Nothing more need be said on the value of the work to the present day exegete of St. Paul's writings. Hitherto it has not been possible for him to make the use of it that it deserves. At the same time the publication in Cambridge *Texts and Studies* will enable a new chapter in the history of Scripture exegesis to be written. It may safely be said that for eleven hundred years no Latin commentary on the Pauline Epistles exercised a greater influence, direct or indirect, than that of Pelagius, and it is time that it should receive the credit it merits. The publication of a scientific text of Pelagius and the interpolations foisted on him will also render the study of all later Latin exegetes simpler; and this is a field that is almost unworked. Finally, the modern theologian will have before him for the first time the words of Pelagius *as he wrote them*, and nothing more. The history of Pelagianism will thus be clarified at its very source.

We have in fact cause to be proud of our first British book, both for its intrinsic quality, and also for the great influence it has exercised. It is no ill omen that our earliest book is a Scripture commentary, if there be any truth in the view that Britain owes her greatness to Scripture study. Certainly the study of the Bible has greatly contributed to mould those ideals for which during the last four years so much of our best has been sacrificed.

A. SOUTER.

A LEAGUE OF NATIONS AND A CHANGE OF HEART.

IT has been repeatedly said that an indispensable condition for the successes of a League of Nations is a "change of heart" among the nations of the League. The statement is undoubtedly true, and it is as far as possible from the object of this article to controvert it. A change of heart is, however, a phrase not without danger in this connection. It may easily be taken to imply more than is really intended. What and how great is the moral change that is necessary before the League of Nations can succeed? What hope is there that the change needed can be actually brought about? There are those who regard the whole scheme as utopian just because a moral change is admitted to be a condition of its success. Why, they want to know, should those who advocate the scheme anticipate so confidently this sudden access of virtue, this general moral conversion of the masses of civilised humanity? Those who raise this objection may be willing to admit that, whether by the influence of Christianity or otherwise, a certain moral progress is visible in the world as the centuries pass. But assuredly the advance is very slow! It is an aeonian process in which a thousand years are as one day. Is there any sound reason to suppose that owing to the Great War, one day will all of a sudden be as a thousand years? No doubt such an unexampled event as this war may well have unexampled results, both for good and for evil, but when we speak of a general change of heart there are those who will suspect that we are being carried away by enthusiasm for an inspiring but impracticable ideal, that in short the Great War has a little turned our heads.

To such a charge—the charge of being unpractical—brought against us by practical men, the answer is in the first place to turn the tables against themselves. In these days, when the war disease has been raging in the very vitals of our civilisation and when each paroxysm of the disease is likely to be more terrible than the one before, so that the very existence of our civilisation is threatened, no policy can be called practical that does not aim with a real chance of success at rooting out the evil. Is it imagined that when German militarism has been demolished wars among civilised nations will cease of themselves? But German militarism is only a symptom after all; it is not the disease itself. While the present international system, or rather lack of system, obtains, and while national ideals remain what they are, nothing could be more unpractical than the hope of avoiding future wars. However completely the coming peace settlement may remove all existing causes of international dispute, fresh cases of rivalry and antagonism are bound to crop up. It is not the solution of a problem in statics we have to find, but a permanent *modus vivendi* for living and expanding forces. Nations are continually rising and falling in wealth, population and power. New discoveries and new inventions are constantly giving fresh values to particular natural products or particular territories. The wisest international settlement can do little to forestall the clash of national interests and ambitions in the future. A single militarist Power would be enough to start a

war. For whatever may be the case among individuals, between States it does not take more than one to make a quarrel. If war is to be avoided under such conditions as that, it can only be by an astounding and all but incredible moral advance, an advance, moreover, not in the majority of nations only, but in every powerful nation at once! If international relations are to remain in their present condition of anarchy (for that is the right word so long as international law has no sanction behind it), then indeed permanent peace can be preserved only through a change of heart so deep and at the same time so universal as to be almost inconceivable. Is that what the "practical man" is relying on?

If, however, by a League of Nations organisation took the place of international anarchy, the change of heart required, though still very real, would be far less fundamental. It would be a change no longer outside the range of reasonable expectation. It would be a change in the realm of ideas rather than of morals.

It is probably true that every war owes its origin in one way or another to the baser elements in human nature, materialism, selfishness, pride, vain-glory, jealousy, or hatred. But these baser elements are not always the stronger. There is happily in our nature an abundance also of better qualities, idealism, unselfishness, loyal devotion; and it is to these that we ought to be able to look to counteract those elements which inevitably make for war. Unfortunately under present conditions no sooner does war loom on the horizon than these better qualities in our nature are quickly enlisted, not against the war-passions, but actually in their support.

Here we come to the heart of the matter. The problem is not so much the moral one of increasing the power of the good forces within us and diminishing the power of the bad. That is the age-long process for which we cannot wait. It is rather the problem of enlisting the good moral forces at our disposal on the side of peace rather than on the side of war. It can hardly be denied that our patriotism, unselfish and loyal as it often is, is apt to be at the same time a somewhat narrow-minded and narrow-hearted emotion. It is not that we adopt the political philosophy of Treitschke. We are shocked at the pagan doctrine which regards as the highest aim of the citizen or statesman the good or the power of his own state. We recognise that that is mere idolatry. Above the "will to power" we set the will of God. Beyond the good of our own land, however conceived, we set the wider good of humanity at large.

The true patriot we feel is he who would have his country fulfil for the good of the world the mission entrusted to it by God. If it came to a clear choice between the good of the whole and the good of our own country, which is only a part of the whole, we acknowledge the principle that it is the good of the whole that must come first. We can have no doubt that that would be God's will, for God has no favourites. He is no respecter of nations any more than of persons. As things are, the claims of our own country upon us are presented to us clearly enough, but we can seldom see so clearly what will be for the advantage of the world as a whole. We may be loyal to the conception of the good of humanity, but there is nothing upon which to focus that loyalty. It remains a

diffused and ineffectual moral sentiment. In practice, therefore, our loyalty and devotion is given to our own country and to no wider entity beyond it. When war threatens it is our own country rather than the world at large whose interests call for and receive the support of our loyalty and our public spirit.

Now it is just here that the League of Nations steps in. For it supplies precisely that focus which we need, that actual institution, that concrete fact round which our wider loyalty can crystallise. A League of Nations will promote that very change of heart upon which its success depends. When that focussing or crystallising process has once been fairly started—full in line as it will be not only with the material interests of the world but above all with our deepest moral and religious aspirations—there is no foretelling how far it may go.

To set up a League of Nations is a great undertaking, and it would be folly to underrate its magnitude. At present we have a congeries of independent sovereign States. Every State clings to its own complete and sovereign independence as to its most cherished natural right. So accustomed is the world to this rather curious regime that it has come to be regarded as the one obvious and inevitable system. And it is just this that the League of Nations will terminate. It is just this cherished sovereign independence that each State as it joins the League will have to some extent to resign. It is indeed a big enterprise! Nevertheless a little consideration will show it to be more feasible than at first sight it looks.

This system of independent sovereign States which has such an imposing appearance, on what after all is it really based? It derives its strength, of course, from just that exclusive character of our patriotism, that focussing of our public spirit upon our own country alone instead of upon the true interests of the world at large, which has been discussed above, and which the change of heart we desire to see would expand and transform. Upon what else does this system rest? It is not rooted in any fundamental trait of human nature. There is nothing inevitable about it. In Christendom it is not even of long standing. It was not the system of the Middle Ages; it was only after the Reformation that it came into force as the recognised theory of international relations. It is difficult to find for it any rational or utilitarian basis. For the principle of nationality indeed—that great watchword and spiritual force of the 19th century—there is plenty to be said. When a group of people, conscious of a certain unity, claims to form a nationality, we have rightly learned to respect that claim. To such a nationality we desire to concede all the freedom it needs in order to develop its own national life and characteristics and to perform its proper part in the world. But such freedom does not imply absolute sovereign independence. The greatest prophet of the national principle, Joseph Mazzini, was also the prophet of international association: "The Europe of the peoples," he said, "will be one; avoiding alike the anarchy of absolute independence and the centralisation of conquest." Far from being of any utility, as the national principle duly safeguarded certainly is, it is just this "anarchy of absolute independence" that leads to wars and preparation for wars on a scale which is endangering the very existence of civilisation.

Nor does this international regime of ours rest upon the general character of modern civilisation. In spite of the immense development during the last hundred years of the national principle our own day has seen such a continuous growth of internationalism that it has almost begun to rival in that respect the Middle Ages themselves. We have international trade, an international labour organisation, international capital, international science, and to some degree international literature. How Governments can work together when it is clearly to their advantage we see in our international postal system. Above all, we have long had a religion of which one of the essential features is that it overrides all boundaries of race and nation. Christianity is Catholic in the original sense of the word; Christianity is international. Far from being rooted in the general character of our civilisation our present international anarchy is in truth in opposition to it; it is an exception and almost an anachronism! We need to see it in its proper historical setting. The mediæval system was the outcome partly of the Empire of Rome and partly of the Christian aspiration for unity. It was a premature and faulty system, and it crashed down before the attacks of the Renaissance and the Reformation. A period of disintegration inevitably followed. When an edifice falls the bricks lie loose till they can be rebuilt into a new structure. First came the dynastic period, when political power was gathered up into the hands of such families as the Hapsburgs and the Bourbons. To that period belonged morally the Hohenzollern family, though born out of due time. The dynastic period was politically one of the least reputable epochs of European history, and its present-day representatives occupied till recently the thrones of the Central Powers. The next stage saw the rise of democracy and nationalism, two foundation principles of the coming socio-political synthesis. To-day the period of disintegration and transition appears to be passing away. The keynote of the present moment, whether in social or political matters, is "reconstruction"; and among the various aspects of that reconstruction not the least important will be the organisation of international relations, the re-introduction on a firm foundation of that unity to which the Middle Ages aspired in vain. In place of such an Emperor as Dante dreamed of there will be the League of Nations. It may even come to pass that in place of the Mediæval papacy the spiritual leadership of Christendom will be in the hands of some representative inter-denominational assembly. However that may be, is there not reason to believe that the present anarchy in international relations is but a passing phase intervening not unnaturally for a few centuries between such unity as was achieved by mediævalism and a unity lying before us of an altogether higher political type, an organisation based on the co-operation of free and democratic nations?

Sir John Seeley laid emphasis on one of the main lines of political development in European history. First in time came the smallest political unit, the tribe; then came the city-state; next the country-state; and later still the "world-state" such as the British Empire or the United States of America. Another equally clear process in these latter days is what is called the shrinkage of the world, the rapid increase between all parts of the world of vital contact and intercourse. A League of Nations (and finally it

may be some Federation of the World) would not only tend towards satisfying the moral and religious aspiration of man for unity, but would be a natural culmination to the two historical tendencies just noticed. A League of Nations appears to lie directly in the line of historical development.

But though our present international regime is founded upon no fundamental fact in our nature, though it is of comparatively recent date, though it is based neither upon utility, nor the general character of our civilisation nor upon our moral and religious aspirations, and though history gives no indication of its permanence, nevertheless an impressive appearance of stability it undoubtedly has. It has to us an air of permanence, just as the Mediæval Empire had to Dante, and for much the same reason. It has the prestige of an established fact. It is fortified by the common illusion that what we have known all our lives, and our fathers and grandfathers before us, will never change.

Let us realise two things: first that it *is* an illusion—that the old order does change; and secondly, that if only the League of Nations can once survive the critical period of its infancy, this same illusion of the established fact will begin to work in its favour; will indeed before long be presenting the League of Nations to the contemporary imagination as the most natural and inevitable thing in the world!

The difficult period of transition has to be surmounted first, and it would be idle to minimise its dangers. Nevertheless there are four good grounds of hope. First and foremost there is the lesson of the great war itself. It is precisely in the immediate future, while the manifold horrors of the war are fresh in all minds, that the dread of the recurrence of such a disaster will be most vivid and constraining. For the first few years at least every nation will be keeping anxious watch round the cradle of the League. Every act that might endanger its life will be regarded as a crime against humanity itself.

Secondly, there is the ever growing power of labour, and labour is for international peace. Even in Central Europe it is no longer showing a lamb-like spirit of submission. On the contrary, now the war is over it is likely to assert itself, there as elsewhere, with a vigour which may prove both disconcerting and dangerous. But its struggles will be on social not on international lines. In its hands the League of Nations may well be safer than some other institutions which till lately seemed firmly rooted. Since the armistice we are already living in a very different world.

Thirdly there is the immense support brought to the League of Nations by the United States of America. America is now actually the most powerful military State in existence. In alliance with the British Empire (with its fleet) her position is dominant. America entered the war definitely and solely to ensure the future peace of the world. She will not lightly forego the end for which she has made such unparalleled efforts. She will have not only preponderant power and a clear will; standing apart from Europe, unentangled in any European complications, with a statesman at her helm great alike in character, wisdom, energy and tact—and tact will be supremely needed—she may be trusted to bring in once more the New World to redress the balance of the Old.

Lastly there is the consideration which has been the main subject of this article, namely, that though a change of heart is no doubt needed if the League of Nations is to succeed, it is a change far less fundamental and difficult of achievement than is sometimes supposed or than the phrase is apt to suggest, a change for which the way has already been prepared in many directions, which the League of Nations will itself do much to promote, and to effect which the Christian Church and every other moral influence among us should be bringing its whole weight to bear.

It has been argued in this article that the change of heart required is not quite so great as it sounds, and is therefore the more practicable. Nevertheless that change of heart and the new and effective union among nations which will depend upon that change and will in turn promote it will form together one of the most momentous forward steps in history. It will be the harvest reaped by the myriads who have sown in tears and blood. It will be a new embodiment of the Christian principle of unity and fellowship, a fresh stone in the building of the spiritual Jerusalem, a nearer approach to the Kingdom of God on earth. There are many who are fired with the glory of this hope. It would be a sad blow to the prestige of the professed spiritual leaders of the people if, failing to recognise the present opportunity, they were to leave it to politicians and laymen to supply not only the practical knowledge and skill but also the moral impetus which the cause demands.

J. P. MALLESON.

CONTINUED EDUCATION AND BOY-LABOUR.

I.

MR. FISHER'S Education Act restores a conception of the position of the working boy, and a valuation of his labour, which, recognised in the simpler industrial order which produced the system of apprenticeship, has been obscured and even reversed in modern times. The apprenticeship system was based upon the principle that a boy in his early working years was in the position of a pupil. His labour was valued not for its present achievement, but for the training in future competence of which it was the instrument. Changed industrial methods have led to the abandonment of this principle. Sub-division of trades, specialisation of processes, the development of machinery, the invention of automatic substitutes for handicraft, and other devices for rapid production on a large scale demand the limited adroitness of the specialist worker rather than the complete mastery of the accomplished craftsman. Formal apprenticeship has largely fallen into disuse. The term indeed survives the reality which it once expressed. But the contract to *teach*—the essence of the apprenticeship agreement—is wanting. The boy is a worker primarily: a learner incidentally. His labour is valued by the employer for its immediate serviceableness; by the boy and the boy's parents for the wages it commands. Under apprenticeship the boy was trained: under modern conditions he is exploited.

To the abandonment of the conception of the working boy as a pupil the modern problem of boy-labour is to be traced. The economic aspect of that problem—the manufacture of the unemployed and the unemployable from untrained and casual boy-workers—has become a commonplace since the Reports of the Royal Commission on the Poor Laws awakened attention to it. But the tendency has been to regard it too narrowly. It has been seen almost exclusively as a problem of the frankly uneducative employments to which the name “blind-alleys” has been given. The typical blind-alley occupations, however—the work, for instance, of messengers, errand-boys, or pages—are but the most unabashed confession of the principle to which industry as a whole has yielded itself. The conception that the boy is to be used, or used up, for the immediate value of his labour, instead of being equipped for future efficiency, if more disastrous in its effects in the blind-alleys than in other kinds of work, is the principle of the employment of boys in every occupation.

The Education Bill bids fair to work a revolution in juvenile industry, because it reasserts the abandoned conception of the working boy as a pupil. By the proposed system of continuation schools, and the requirement to attend them for 320 hours a year up to the age of eighteen, it embeds education within the working day, instead of relegating it as an extra to the close of it. It combines working with learning. The boy-worker is once more a pupil; and the industrial world is forced to adjust his employment to this position. The recovered principle carries in itself promise

of reform ; but practically the realisation of this promise will depend upon the nature of continued education and the intimacy of its relation to industry.

II.

(1) The ideal is not merely that a working boy should continue to go to school, but that education and work should interact. Under the apprenticeship system the practice of elementary work was itself the means of training. The workshop was the continuation school and the master workman was the teacher. Modern conditions make workshop training difficult, and, at best, partial. A boy can seldom learn his trade as a whole, and if he could this complete mastery would not be industrially valuable. To make work and education interact is therefore difficult. But unless they interact education will hardly improve the conditions of juvenile labour, or react at all upon them. A fear has been expressed lest education under the new Bill should be exclusively vocational training, and become a slavish ministry to the needs of industry. The opposite danger, however, is probably more serious—the danger that, though continued in working hours, education should be loosely or inaptly related to the working life. Cultural and vocational training are not, or need not be, opposing ideals. In the continuation school they should be combined. The system of continued education should grow from sympathetic co-operation between employers of labour and education authorities; for if employers refuse facilities for practical training, or are indifferent to it, while the education in the schools is academic and aloof, the industrial position of the working boy will remain, in spite of all that the schools can do for him, a position of exploitation.

(2) This involves, first, deliberate development of training possibilities within the work itself. The change in industrial method which has subdivided and specialised trades and processes, and substituted mechanical production for handicraft, has not rendered training valueless. A boy has still somehow to *learn*, for instance, the sectional engineering trades of moulding, fitting, or turning, whether his learning is a matter of systematic training or merely, in the current phrase, of “picking up” his trade. Trade training is not neglected because it is inapplicable, but merely because no one has taken pains to systematise it. The development of practical training within the work would react profoundly upon the conditions and prospects of juvenile labour. It would reevaluate work according to the training demanded for proficiency in it. It would eliminate competence from incompetence, fitness from unfitness; and would establish a test by which boys might be drafted to the work for which they are best fitted. It would give to continued education on its technical side a foundation to build upon. Conferences between employers in the manual trades, and especially in engineering, could without difficulty produce such a systematic standard of practical training. Several large engineering firms have established trade schools for their apprentices: the fruits of their experience would give practical guarantee to the training adopted. Without such a standard, the

continuation schools will be groping in the dark in the attempt to co-ordinate labour and learning.

(3). The Departmental Committee on Education in Relation to Employment After the War, whose recommendations as to school age and continued education are substantially embodied in the Education Act, worked out a tentative course for the new continuation schools, avoiding the opposite dangers of indefinite generalisation and of too narrow precision. They seek intimately to relate education with labour, while maintaining the ideal of general culture. The curriculum, they say, should "preserve a balance between the technical and the humanistic elements." The four years' course, it is suggested, should be divided into two equal stages. The first stage, for pupils between the ages of fourteen and sixteen, would be general, though with some vocational bent. The second stage, for pupils between the ages of sixteen and eighteen, would be predominantly technical and vocational, though general education would be continued into it. The curriculum in the first stage includes English, Mathematics, Science, and Manual and Physical training. English, which forms the basis of the curriculum, and runs through the four years' course, aims at training in self-expression, encouragement of a love of reading, and a widening of outlook. In the Mathematical Group Practical Mathematics and Practical Drawing take chief place for those engaged in industrial pursuits,—the expression "industrial" being used in the narrower sense of the manual trades. The Manual and Scientific Groups would aim at developing intelligence and "handiness" by the practice of manual work; and for boys in trades which need them mechanics and physics would be taught. Systematic physical training for all should be associated with instructions in elementary physiology and the laws of health. At about the age of sixteen the boy, settled, it is presumed, in the work in which he means to continue, would enter the second and more entirely vocational course. For boys engaged in the great industries of Agriculture, Engineering, Building, Mining, and the Textile Trades, there would be three alternative courses. A "Major Course," designed for students who seem fitted to attain to the higher positions, would give advanced technical instruction. For those with humbler vocational aspirations a "Minor Course" would be provided, dealing with the operations of "a single Trade, such as Pattern-Making, Moulding, Fitting, or Smithing." For those engaged upon industrial occupations requiring little or no technical training there would be a further course. The example given is that of the textile trades. Such a course would deal with the history of the trade and with the mechanical contrivances which are used in it. For those in commercial and clerical work similar graded courses would be provided. Finally, to boys engaged upon occupations which require no vocational instruction courses of general education would be offered.*

(4). The Committee's scheme is perhaps as firmly defined as any theoretical scheme can be made. It holds the balance evenly between

* Final Report of the Departmental Committee on Juvenile Education in Relation to Employment After the War, 1917, pp. 32-36.

general and vocational education, and makes some provision for boys in the various grades of employment. But, considered in view of the present state of juvenile labour, and as a contribution to the solution of the problems which it brings, it shows significant gaps and ambiguities. It makes a sharp demarcation between occupations demanding trained knowledge and skill, and those which are hardly susceptible to vocational education. In effect it abandons both the automatic or "repetition" worker in the manual trades, and the boys in "blind-alley" occupations, to the position not only of untrained, but of untrainable, labourers. For the repetition workers,—the textile operatives, used as example, are fairly representative,—courses of instruction are provided not *in* their trades, but *about* them. For blind-alley workers there is nothing save general education. Vocational training is frankly abandoned.

Whether this complete surrender is inevitable may be questioned. Training is not inapplicable to the semi-automatic processes of industry; and it would probably be found possible to design trade courses for the repetition workers bearing a real relationship to workshop practice. The pure blind-alleys obviously give no scope for training, for if they did they would cease to be blind-alleys. But there are many kinds of work which in practice are generally without prospect or regular promotion which organisation might redeem from this reproach and make avenues to adult position; and the application of training to such kinds of work would stimulate their conversion into progressive employment.

If, however, school training were extended as far as possible and specialised to meet the needs of every class of workers for whom any training is required, a large residuum of occupations into which thousands of boys enter every year would remain untouched by education, and the continued schooling of those engaged upon them would be without direct connection with their working life. This discovery in itself might not be without influence upon juvenile labour. The low regard in which training is at present held, and the uncertainty of it, even in employment for which it is needed, blur the distinction between progressive and unprogressive work. The blind-alleys in which training and prospect are wanting are not glaringly isolated from work in trades in which training is lightly valued and prospect precarious. But the development of training in workshop and school, and the dependence of prospect upon it, would emphasise the value of trained skill over immediately profitable employment. Demand for prospect and training would be created. Employers of kinds of boy-labour partially susceptible to training would be constrained to develop the educational possibilities in their work in order to induce boys to enter it. The blind-alleys would stand out in warning contrast from regular employment.

III.

(1). Even where definite vocational training is impossible, the indirect influence of the requirement to attend continuation school upon boy-labour and boy-life would be immense. In 1911-12,

of the 2,700,000 juveniles between the ages of fourteen and eighteen, 2,200,000, or 81.5 per cent., were untouched by education.* Leaving school, they drifted not only from care, but from ken. Entering, many of them, upon occupations which not only fail to train, but, by reason of monotony and lack of purpose, blunt and atrophy mind and character, they began their perilous journey unhelped and even unnoticed by the State which had spent money and labour on their earlier education. Legislation, so far as it protected them at all, was sporadic, occasional, and partial, not worked out on any clear principle, but improvised to correct glaring abuses in this industry or that. The bare provision that every boy between fourteen and eighteen shall remain under educational supervision will do much to remove these anomalies. As the Departmental Committee on Education in Relation to Employment After the War put it, "Some handrail is required over the bridge which crosses the perilous waters of adolescence, and it is this which a sound system of continuation classes may help to provide." The boy will not be lost to sight. If he makes a false step into work, he will at least be under the eye of those who, with knowledge of him and of his work, may offer guidance to retrieve the mistake; while education, keeping his faculties alert and widening his outlook, will save him from the dullness and acquiescence in purposeless labour which, as things are, make it difficult to rouse the boy, wrongly started, to a sense of his position and to the effort to improve it.

(2) The Education Act gives powers to local authorities to extend medical inspection into the years of continued schooling. It is a pity that this should not be made obligatory. "As a result of the School Medical Service," write the Health of Munition Workers Committee, "much evidence is accumulating as to the effect of employment on children while at school, but no similar evidence is available as to the effects of employment after school age. Records, if carefully kept, should not only be of immediate value as giving evidence of the presence of undue strain, but may prove of more permanent value as throwing light on the many difficult problems arising out of the effects of industry on health."† Such records would guide those whose business it is to advise boys as to the choice of work, and would provide data upon which legislation controlling juvenile labour should be drawn. It would render possible an approach to the ideal succinctly stated by Sir George Newman, "that no child shall enter employment unsuited to his age or physical capacity; that as far as possible activities directed towards the amelioration of physical defects discovered at the leaving inspection and subsequent after-care shall not cease, even though they may alter in kind, at the moment the child enters employment, and that industrial conditions should be supervised by the proper authorities in relation to their influence upon the physique and health of the young worker."‡

(3) The efficiency of the system of continued education and its

* Report of Departmental Committee on Education in Relation to Employment After the War, p. 3.

† Report on Juvenile Labour, 1916, p. 8.

‡ Report of the Chief Medical Officer to the Board of Education, 1916, p. 119.

reaction upon juvenile work will depend not only upon the intimacy of its connection with industry, but also upon a sound system of primary education, unhindered by the fatigue and distraction of child-labour, and, hardly less, upon the careful choice of a boy's employment. The Education Bill by raising the school-leaving age to fourteen, prohibiting earlier exemption, and stringently regulating child-labour removes at a stroke the evils of "half-time" and excessive out-of-school labour. For the guidance of the boy into work it makes no provision. Yet the efficiency of vocational training must largely depend upon reasoned vocational choice. The recklessness with which boys plunge into work has hardly on the large scale been checked by the efforts of Juvenile Employment Bureaux under Education Authority or Board of Trade. The numbers influenced by them are too small to reverse bad traditions of vocational entry or to create demand for training and prospect in work. In some cases the Juvenile Employment Bureaux do, and attempt, little more than registration—the routine work of a Labour Exchange. They "place" boys in work rather than guide them into the work for which they are fitted. While the boy is still at the elementary school, therefore, the choice of his future employment should be made. Instruction in the industrial openings of the locality might well be given during the last year of school life. Indications of vocational fitness should be noted. Each boy should be examined and advised by the supervisor, or executive officer, of the Juvenile Employment Bureau, which should be set up by the Education Authority.

Legislation controlling boy-labour will need also to be extended and co-ordinated. Such provisions as those with which the Factory and Workshops Act protects young workers from excessive hours and harmful employment in the trades which it covers should be made to embrace all occupations in which boys work. Knowledge of the effects upon character and health of different kinds of work which continued school supervision makes possible will indicate the lines on which this industrial law should advance; but continued education will be hampered, as primary education has been hampered by child-labour, until working conditions are uniformly controlled.

SPENCER J. GIBB.

HOW DOG STEALERS WORK.

STRICTLY speaking they do not "work"—in the ordinary meaning of the word—except when they are serving a term of imprisonment with hard labour. Yet, when they are before the magistrates, they are almost always described as "labourers"—doubtless a master-stroke of irony on the part of the station sergeant who makes out the charge-sheet, for the association of the dog-thief with labour is of the remotest character. But the dog-thief has his wiles, which are guarded as jealously as secrets of state—even more jealously perhaps. He belongs to a "profession" which, if it has not eminence, is not without its traditions, and Besant, in his searchings into 18th-century records, found that dog-stealing was carried on over a hundred years ago, and those who practised it were then said to live in the region of slums lying between the Walworth and Old Kent roads.

The increase in the number of valuable dogs, who are often bought for £25, £50, or £100, has added to the temptation to lay unlawful hands upon man's canine friend, and advertisements appear almost daily in the agony columns of the newspapers in something like the following terms:—

LOST.—A West Highland terrier dog, four years old, answers to the name of "Jock." £5 reward will be paid to anyone returning him to Mrs. —, etc.

When a number of such advertisements appear day after day it is a sign that the dog-thieves are busy, and Scotland Yard increases its vigilance; while the men and women who own valuable dogs will be wise to see that they are not allowed to run about the streets at will. Though the average dog-stealer is not well educated, or capable of devising brilliant schemes of illegality, such as are attributed to diamond thieves and bank robbers, he has to exercise a considerable amount of patience and ingenuity if he is to be successful, and has to be a careful student of canine, as well as human, nature.

The methods by which dogs are enticed are varied. One of the most notorious of the thieves bakes liver hard, powders it, and places the substance in the "turn up" of his trousers. The intended victim, scenting the meat, follows him until the rascal considers it safe to pick him up, when he takes off the collar and replaces it with another, after which he takes the dog to some place of detention until he sees an opportunity of converting it into money. This is probably one of the most common of the tricks which are employed, the use of cheese being also frequently resorted to, though some thieves vary the procedure by saturating the meat with oil of aniseed or rubbing on their trouser-legs matter which will attract dogs and cause them to follow close at heel. At other times the man will be seen leading a female dog in the neighbourhood of the intended victim's house; the latter follows the decoy, and his fate is sealed. Should a police officer interfere, the thief assumes an air of injured innocence, declaring that he did not know the dog was following him, and his dissertation upon the civic rights of law-abiding people is said, on such occasions, to be extremely interesting.

Then there are the "snatchers," who linger about, usually in couples, waiting for an opportunity to pick up a dog whose master

or mistress may be engaged in window gazing, or in conversation with a friend. If the dog be small, it is put into some convenient receptacle by one of the men, who makes off rapidly, while his accomplice waits about to ascertain what happens when the theft is discovered. When asked if he has seen such and such a kind of dog about, he usually says that he is almost sure that he saw one go in a certain direction—always the opposite one to that in which his confederate has gone, and, in following this false clue, the owner often loses valuable time, and makes the recovery of his dog less probable.

Dog-stealing is occasionally done by women, who, dressed in excellent style, pick up toy dogs, and place them in bags containing narcotics, in order that the animal may be prevented from raising suspicion by barking. It is stated that women, attired in nursing costume, have been found carrying drugged dogs in their arms, though to the casual observer they were apparently holding babies. The writer, however, has not been able to verify this statement, though it is quite within the bounds of possibility, and the trick has certainly been attempted in pre-war days by ladies bringing their dogs from abroad, in an effort to evade the quarantine regulations.

A trick by which detection is rendered difficult is that of soaking a hare's foot or piece of rag in aniseed oil and trailing it from the home of the coveted dog at the time when it is known to take its morning or evening run. The dog picks up the scent, and the thief, waiting a few streets away, is soon welcoming him with open arms.

It should be understood that the thieves do not always act promptly, but often carry out their plans in a leisurely and carefully-planned manner. Cases have come before the courts in which payment has been received for the dog before it has been stolen. Sometimes they will note the points of a dog, watch the columns of the Press for an advertisement asking for this type of animal, or even go to the length of advertising it themselves, and, being sure of their customer, then obtain the dog and despatch it to the customer as soon as it comes into their possession. A dog-dealer in the Midlands, however, was recently badly hit by his failure to supply the dog which he had advertised, and the evidence in court showed that he was in the habit of advertising dogs which he had not got. Full credit must be given to him for a desire to make up the deficiency.

It is probable that the method most dangerous to the person of the dog-stealer is that in which the thieves, seeing a dog being led, cut the lead with a "clipper" while the attention of the person leading it is distracted by confederates. As this method involves a risk which the none-too-courageous thief is not partial to, this manner of appropriation is not so popular with the fraternity as are others of the non-hazardous variety.

Some of the more prosperous of thieves have ponies and traps, in which they drive about looking for valuable dogs, and thus have greater facilities for carrying out their schemes than have the lower ranks of the trade. Frequently the thieves form a "ring" and go on tour, as was shown by a case heard at Leeds, where the leader of a gang of men was sent to prison for eight months with hard labour for stealing a Pomeranian, valued at £10. The directing genius of this gang was stated by the police to have made his living for the last twelve years by dog-stealing, paying systematic visits, along

with his subordinates, to various towns in the North of England, with sad results to owners of valuable dogs. Sometimes owners are induced to send their dogs to addresses in other parts of the country, from which they are immediately removed by the thieves, and the sender hears no more of the dog or the promised payment.

Sufficient has been said to show the methods of the people who live by robbing others of what are sometimes their most cherished possessions. Having secured the dog, the thief has to find some means of transmuting it into coin of the realm, and to the experienced "professional" (save the mark!) the task presents little difficulty. There is a police axiom, "No receiver, no thief," and receivers of stolen dogs are many. The receiver is to be found in many places. Down East, up West, and in the suburbs he thrives on the profits of his business. Sometimes he is of the same class as the thief, often he is of better education, and carries himself with the jaunty air of the successful man. His success is not at all due to his profits on stolen dogs, for he usually carries on a bona-fide business in buying and selling, and occasionally breeding dogs. He usually manages to keep himself from coming into conflict with the police, though he excites the displeasure of the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons when he describes himself as a "canine specialist," a designation which he is always prepared to justify in a court of law or at any other bar. At other times he is simply a "dog-fancier," and like the poets, he likes his fancy to roam free; the greater the freedom the better he is pleased. He has always a warm welcome for any dog which may have been found "straying," the only test he applies before extending his hospitality being proof of the good breeding of his guest. For the aristocracy of the canine world he has an imperishable regard, and for them his door is ever open.

To this "dog-fence" comes the thief who does not care to deal with customers at first hand, and from him he receives a small part of the real value of the dog. The "fence" of course has to pay rent and rates, and he therefore claims the largest share in the profit of the transaction. One choice specimen of the "rent-payers" boasted recently that he had bought two puppies for a few shillings and sold one of them for over £300. This, if true, may be regarded as an extreme case, but it is well known that the thief who works through a receiver gets but a small proportion of the value of the animal.

When the "dog-fence" is ambitious, he resorts to means of his own to obtain his supply of dogs. An officer in the London Police Force, speaking of this class of man, said, "Men, women, and children are paid by him to scour the neighbourhood for valuable dogs. Not long ago one of these scouts was caught, who had passed many hundreds of dogs into the hands of these well-to-do receivers, with the aid of a child. This man's method was to frequent the neighbourhood of better-class houses in the company of a little boy. The boy's business was to wait for the dogs as they were let out by servants in the early morning, and entice them away. The advantage of this method is that, whereas a man seen loitering for a long period in a certain locality might arouse suspicion, the presence and gambols of the urchin are considered to be perfectly natural and suggest no thought of evil. These receivers would seem to have a constitutional objection to enquiry; inquisitiveness is their

chief aversion. They ask for no very explicit information as to whence the dog has come, and they strongly resent any such desire for enlightenment on the part of other people. If one of the other people should be a police officer or the owner of the dog, he is always ready to produce someone who will swear that he bred the dog, or that he bought it at some remote period from some person who is not at the moment accessible.

It is often very difficult to distinguish between the honest dealer and the others. Quite recently a lady living in London lost a dog which she had purchased two years before at an establishment whose name is synonymous with rectitude. The dog, to which she attached great value apart from its intrinsic worth, disappeared mysteriously, and though the aid of the smartest detective officers was requisitioned, and the most active enquiry was made for two or three weeks, not a trace of the lost pet could be found. Giving up hope of ever recovering him, the lady decided to purchase another animal of similar breed, and, having been so fortunate at the establishment referred to, went thither. She passed in front of the dog-cages, and came to the one in which, two years before, there had reposed her lost pet. As soon as she reached the cage the dog which then occupied it behaved in an extraordinary way, endeavouring to tear down the bars. The recognition was mutual, and the dealer, who seemed to be as much astonished as the lady, was incredulous of her story. A detective was called in, and the lady took her dog away triumphantly, the officer advising her not to pay the price asked for the animal, though she was quite prepared to do so in order to regain possession of her favourite. It should be added that no payment was ever made for this dog to the establishment in question.

The dog-dealer who acts as a "fence" realises that it would not always be safe to deal with animals which are obtained from the district in which he carries on business, and a very large number of dogs are sent by the thieves to distant parts of the country by rail or steamer. A number—it is impossible to say how many—are sent abroad, and the chance of recovery is thus reduced to a minimum. The thieves in the provinces have "London agents," who receive and sell the dogs in their shops or in the open air markets. London thieves, again, have confederates in the large provincial towns, and there is known to be a very extensive exchange of dogs between these people.

Stolen dogs are often taken to a railway station outside the town to which they belong, preferably a wayside, country station, and thence are sent to a receiver in another town. Sometimes the receiver is simply a thief who is ready to exchange with the sender any dogs which are not suitable, or are unsafe, for local disposal. Very often, however, the thief and his "pals" sell the dog themselves, and at places like Club Row, in the East End of London, many such dogs change hands. The dog-market on Sunday mornings, between 10.30 and 1 o'clock, at Club Row, is one of the sights of London. The attendance of a large number of police officers, in uniform and plain clothes, gives a hint of the light in which the market and its *habitués* are regarded. It would be wrong to say that all the dogs sold there have been illegally obtained, for it is obvious that many of them have been bred by the

sellers, but a very large number have been obtained in a manner which would scarcely bear investigation. Here you may find men dressed in the cast-off garments of a stable hand, who will offer to sell you a well-bred dog at something like its market value, and, when you turn away, will huskily enquire, "Wot's it wurf t'yer, guv'nor?" With great volubility he will expatiate on the good points of the dog, and, if you ask him for it, is ready to tell you its name, though you will not find that the dog always responds to it when you use it. Many a sorrowing dog-owner has found his lost friend at Club Row, and, with the aid of a police officer, has taken him joyfully out of the possession of his captor. As recognition of its rightful owner is one of the tests applied in such cases, the wily vendor sometimes drugs the animal, and endeavours to persuade the police that the apathy of "Fido" towards the claimant is a sure indication of the falsity of the claim.

In large provincial towns stolen dogs are often offered for sale on Saturday nights in the market yards or public squares, and in this connection the writer has been told of an impudent fraud practised on a gentleman who was rash enough to purchase a nice-looking dog offered for sale by a man whom he had never seen before, and was not likely to see again. He led the dog away, and after he had gone some hundred yards the animal began to struggle and tried to break away from him, in an effort to join some men who were calling him. The men came up, took hold of the dog, which they declared belonged to them, and threatened to give the gentleman in charge for stealing it, then they went away, leaving the astonished speculator to realise that buying a dog does not always mean undisturbed possession.

Many dog-thieves are as great believers in the efficacy of advertisement as the most prosperous of pill or breakfast food manufacturers. The "For Sale" and "Wanted" columns of the Press are for them full of romance and of thrills of excitement far excelling those to be found in the pages of Dumas. If they find that someone is anxious to purchase a toy Pom, they will assiduously search the district for one, and woe betide any specimen of that variety which may happen to take a walk unattended. While a poor mongrel can wander the streets for days without arousing any suspicion that he is alone in the world, the highly-bred dog can hardly get to the end of his street without meeting someone who is only too anxious to find him a home. Beauty in distress never appeals in vain to the heart of the dog-thief. Again, the thief often inserts an advertisement in the Press, sometimes referring to a dog which he or a friend of his has, or hopes to have. Answers to such advertisements usually reveal that the terms are "cash down" and communications have to be addressed to one of the small shops where letters may be called for on payment of a small fee. The cheque or postal order is cashed, and the dog is forwarded. The original owner is the poorer by the loss of some trusted friend and companion, the new owner has a dog which he could have obtained as cheaply and probably more cheaply from a reputable dealer, and the thief is provided with the means of paying for a debauch for himself and friends.

All stolen dogs, however, are not sold or offered for sale as soon as they are obtained possession of; very many of them are hidden

in cellars or other dismal places to await the offering of a reward or until the "hue and cry" is over, or for other purposes which shall be dealt with later. After an arrest the police have often searched premises held by dog-thieves, and they invariably find a large number of dogs, often under conditions of a heart-rending nature. The cellars are dark, damp and cold, infested with vermin, and reeking with foul smells. Many dogs have been rescued from these noisome dens, only to die of the diseases which they have contracted there. Here, for days and weeks, sometimes months, lie the unfortunate dogs which have been taken from homes which they will never enter again. Unhappy exiles, doomed to a living death in a horrible dungeon, victims of the greed of low, cunning men, who are without pity or remorse for the pain they inflict on their victims, or on the owners of those victims.

Some of the dogs which have come out of these dungeons bear life-long marks of the brutal ill-treatment they receive, doubtless because they whine or bark in terror at their unaccustomed surroundings. A dog recovered a month or two ago in Club Row bore many weals from the lash, although it was one of the most docile of pets. If a dog dies under the ill-treatment his skin, if undamaged, may be sold to dealers in animals' skins.

Having dealt with the methods employed by those who steal dogs in order to sell them again, we may consider the other objects for which they are taken from their lawful owners. Dogs are occasionally taken because they are wearing valuable collars; because they can be used for breeding purposes (sometimes they are returned when the object of the theft is accomplished); in order to prevent them from being shown in competitions; or in order to dispose of their skins to dealers. Such reasons, however, are not common. There is another reason for stealing dogs, and that is in order to obtain the reward which is almost certain to be offered where the dog has a high intrinsic or sentimental value. In such cases the thief trades upon the affection of the dog-owner for his four-footed friend, and relies on the anxiety of the owner to recover the dog to counterbalance his desire to bring the offender to justice.

A curious point that may be noticed is that it is illegal to advertise publicly that a reward will be paid for the restoration of a dog, if the advertisement also states that no questions will be asked as to how it came into the possession of the thief or his confederates. Those wishing to recover their dogs when they know they are being held for reward are therefore careful not to make any public offer, but occasionally they do so privately. The person who accepts such a reward is guilty of an offence, but in such cases he takes due care not to expose himself to any risk of being captured. In his anxiety to recover his dog the owner is often ready to pay a sum much greater than the value of the animal, and the fraternity trades upon this knowledge.

CHARLES R. JOHNS.

LITERARY SUPPLEMENT.

LIST OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
1. THE NEW ORESTES. By J. E. G. DE M.	101
2. REVIEWS	105
LORD BRYCE'S ADDRESSES; REBUILDING BRITAIN; BELIEF AND FAITH; TALES OF THE SORBONNE; THE CANADIAN CONSTITUTION.	
3. SHORTER REVIEWS:—"The Churches at the Cross- roads," &c.	116
4. NOTICES OF BOOKS	118

THE NEW ORESTES.

DR. BATTLE was in his very best form on the Sunday that lies between Christmas and the New Year. He took as his text a passage out of the first lesson for the morning service, "The redeemed shall walk there; and the ransomed of the Lord shall return." Mr. Oldham, rector of Little Green Moss, went to the first evening lesson for his text, "Her warfare is accomplished," and he, too, was in his best manner. Mr. Miles, at the little chapel, took for his text the phrase from the second evening lesson, "The Beast was taken," and he also was at the very top of his style. Some who heard Dr. Battle and some who heard Mr. Oldham in the morning heard Mr. Miles in the evening on this unique occasion, and all were convinced that scholarly and profound as were the Established clergy, Mr. Miles surpassed them in the passion of his welcome to the Prisoners of War. It had been a tremendous week. Not only had prisoners returned, but the dead had returned, and there had been more tears of joy in Wiltwater parish than ever there had been tears of mourning in the darkest days. But let us see the matter a little more in detail, for, after all, it is an event that will not happen again, and it is good to see it as the country folk of all classes saw it: this event of port after stormy seas and the return of war mariners to the place where they would be.

First the scene: Winter reveals much that summer hides, and who does not know the winter scene cannot appreciate the bosky summer, and know what miracles are hidden by this belt of bending trees, what signs of antiquity, traces of the old men who lived before history was, are hidden in the seven-foot bracken and the knee-deep shining heather or gleaming myrtle-tinted whortles. To-day, on this crisp afternoon, the lowlands are singularly lovely. The streams of pure water are booming along with ripple and foam, thinking of the spring that is, after all, not so very far away, and down here in the sheltered valley the grass has little of the winter deadness that lies over the gray green of the upland meadows. Indeed, here and there in very sheltered nooks that spy the south a primrose peers, and, with bold comprehension of its place in the scheme of beauty, on a cottage wall a wealth of golden jessamine

defies the winter solstice. It is, perhaps, not strange that the English flowers of the winter should first be golden and then silver. The golden aconite, the golden jessamine, the golden furze (which here and there shows premonitory blooms) the golden primrose, and the golden lines of the sunset are linking the autumn that is dead with the spring that is unborn across the sheltered English vale where the corn and hay of last year stand in stately rows of shapely stacks, golden habitations of the fairies and gnomes who lie and nod among the warm fragrance listening with pricking faun-like ears to the murmur of the streams splashing under ancient bridges and by villages of immemorial names on and out to the sea to tell the world that England is herself, serene and lovely after the shock or passion of unexampled war. And if the winter lowlands are quiet and still, filled with the quietude of meditation on the lessons of history which they have helped to make through a millennium, filled with a quietude deepened by the church-going bell, the long wooded slopes on to the moor are not less touched with revelation. Here the hand of man is less apparent, and as the traveller wanders up the winding hill he feels himself approaching primeval things as he sees great hollies that towns know nothing of, shining full of red and yellow berries caught by the sunset breaking from the west, sees mystic yews vast in proportion, full of deep shadowy memories of the days when Cæsar had not been, great oaks, with spacious room beneath them, hiding with dull golden leaves of autumn the golden buds of spring, weird beeches with serpentine roots grasping the motherland, bending larches mothering exquisite birches, grim elms with hungry arms guarding the lanes, and under those naked trees, where innumerable buds are shining in tiny exquisite curved points, stretches of mossy undergrowth. Into this woodland scene the sunset pours its wealth of gold, and birds with sudden clamour proclaim the vesper hour. And so the traveller emerges on the moor, and sees in the mystic sunset light vast naked expanses, hill bending into hill, the lines of union standing out in clear-cut fashion, lines of beauty that give a largeness to the landscape as the wind from the moor gives a largeness to the heart. And as the day dies human lights peep out here and there, and somewhere a clock strikes, a veritable compline bell that brings heavy-treading men and beasts home from their labours, and sets the plover calling in sad notes across the passionless twilight.

For years some such vision had been, in its winter or summer, its spring or autumn garb, in the minds of men who had been prisoners and captives in an alien land. The very scents of an English countryside had haunted them, had, in days of mockery, brutality, starvation, savagery, uncleanness, hopelessness, kept them alive. Suffering had dulled their hearts, but the memory of England, of the far-off chance of seeing her again, of feeling the vibration of her turf, of hearing the call of her birds, of touching her woodland flowers, had kept many a heart beating in days of great mental sorrow, of great physical torment, of great spiritual

despair to recall which is in itself an agony. Yet these men, buoyed with hope, never lost courage. They were brave, insolently brave, when such courage often meant death. They defied their lot and their tormentors, fearing them not, and yet when food came from home, and they were allowed to have it, they shared it with their tormentors. And they were just. They responded to kind treatment when they got it, and placed all kindness on record with more alacrity than they recorded their sufferings. Not a kind action that an Englishman received in Germany was forgotten, and this fact will prove once again that a sense of justice is a distinguishing possession of the English race. But it was the hunger for home that kept the captives and the martyrs alive, a hunger that only death, if death, could destroy.

"We will not dwell to-day, my dear friends," said Dr. Battle in the peroration to his sermon, "we will not dwell too deeply on the sufferings of these heroes and of those hardly less heroic folk who waited for them at home. To suffer is mortal, to be patient in suffering is the first touch of immortality. Upon that patience I would rather dwell to-day. It was a patience which was inspired with hope and irradiated with faith. Nothing could destroy that faith, that hope, that love. Some of you may recall the moment in the *Electra*, that Sophoclean masterpiece, when the attendant of Orestes glides upon the scene, and tells the miserable mother, the expectant sister, "*Orestes, . . . he is dead.*" *Electra* has no hope. Not so the common people, whom, I take it, the great tragedian personified in his *Chorus*. They declared "*he reigns in fullest life.*" To them at the darkest hour there was the hope that they did not understand, but which you, in the light of the Christian revelation, know well enough. The sister of *Electra* has faith that he still lives, even on the earth. But *Electra* has no faith: she believes that an urn which is given her by a disguised stranger holds the ashes of her brother, and she mourns for the "*nothingness*" that she holds in her arms. And then the mysterious stranger reveals himself and she cries: ὦ φθέγγμ', ἀφίκον; "*O Voice! And art thou come?*" My friends, this coming of Orestes to *Electra* from the dead has happened among us. And it happens, too, even with those whose sons, whose brothers, whose husbands have laid down their lives. One day those who are bereaved will, in an ecstatic moment, turn from the dust and ashes of our mortal sojourn, and suddenly will say "— and the old clergyman, bent forward from his pulpit, holding his little volume of Sophocles in his left hand, lent forward and said, with tears streaming down his cheeks, "*will say 'O! Voice! and art thou come?': Voice of the dearly beloved, voice of one who has long since done with tears; the voice of one who, as a babe, a child, a youth, a man was the centre of our hearts, the voice of one who loved his home so well that he died for it, and waits to speak to us beyond the wells of light. 'O Voice, and art thou come?'*"

Whether the congregation, as a whole, understood the old man

is doubtful. But his habitual Greek quotation struck home here and there. His son, the Colonel, said to his wife, "I never understood the beastly classics before. The particles have come into the sunshine." And Mr. William Warlock, not an habitual Churchgoer, took in the largeness of the view. Mr. Warlock had a great respect for Dr. Battle, though they very often crossed swords on this or that question of social progress. But on a question of ultimate religious values, they were at one save that the old herbalist was more of a mystic than the old clergyman, and carried parallels too far perhaps. The earth to him was a mirror, in which the heavenly pattern, blurred in the process, was reflected for our learning. And so the story of Electra and Orestes struck home, or rather the rector's application of it. To the herbalist physical death meant little, personality meant everything, and so it was certain to him that the dead reign "in fullest life." With this very creed he had comforted many mourners, and among them Mrs. Barle and her six children and Mrs. Alfred Worthy, two women who were destined to see miracles.

The reported death of Alfred Worthy, the gigantic seaman, whose smiling countenance and powers as a story-teller and a milker had long fascinated every farm on the moor, had come as a cruel blow to many a hearth. But it was accepted as one of the burdens of the war, and would have passed into a matter of memory if it had not been for the attitude of young Mrs. Worthy. She refused to believe the news, disdained all forms of mourning, declared that he would float into the village in his accustomed fashion at the end of the war, and, to the great scandal of her neighbours, continued to live as she lived before the news came, looking after the baby and talking to him about Daddy in the quietest and most confident way. The only person who had any sympathy with her was Mr. Warlock. He said: "She be an example of faith to we. I do think she be *keeping* he alive by her faith wheresoever he be. Let her be. She be no witch. She be an example of faith which do move mountains and raise the dead." So on the last Sunday in the old year, the last year of war, she came in the evening and sat in Mrs. Multon's kitchen with a number of folk gathered after church or chapel, and listened to the talk about the rector's sermon. "I do not think much o' that Electry," said she, "but then she wur only a blood relation, and hadn't seen he since he wur little boy. Now I do know Alfred be coming back, do we not, baby?" And the folk smiled at each other the smile of compassion. But she was right.

* * * * *

He floated down into the village on New Year's Eve. The Red Cross Car that brought him from the hospital followed him down the hill. The driver had humoured his wish to walk down to his cottage, but was taking no risks. Alfred had determined that his arrival should be a surprise. He always made his visits home a surprise, and he wanted everything to be as usual. But nothing could be as usual. The only recog-

nisable things about him were his unconquerable smile and his iron will. He had crowned a career in a salt mine with an escape soon after November 11th, 1918, and there was very little more of him than a smile and a will to conquer that arrived in France. People on the hill wondered who this strange ghost could be, a ghost that smiled and strode on. But his wife knew him, was waiting for him with a gesture of proud certitude. And so Orestes came home. He did more than come home. His will carried him to the farm that night, and he lay in his accustomed place in front of the great hearth, with many cushions to save his bones. He wished everything to be as usual. And he smiled with profound satisfaction as the old fiddler played the New Year in. "Sing 'Hwome again,'" he said to a young girl who kept looking at him with fear in her eyes. And she sang:—

"He be home from the sea,
He be home from the land,
An' glad do we be
To hold his dear hand—
Hwome again."

"It be Peace," he said, "an' the glad New Year be come, I be home again, be I not?" And Mrs. Worthy took his hand, and the old fiddler made soft music in the half-light. So faith had one more conquest, and the glad new age began.

J. E. G. DE M.

REVIEWS.

LORD BRYCE'S ADDRESSES.*

These essays and addresses reflect very usefully the variations of thought of a distinguished thinker and jurist during the course of the Four Years' War, Lord Bryce. The earlier essays, dealing with neutral nations, the attitude of this country during the war, the relation of war to human progress, the Presidential addresses of 1915 and 1916 to the British Academy, stand almost as they were written. We are told that

The earlier essays are left almost unchanged, because they were written to convey to foreign readers a concise and so far as possible unbiassed account of the motives and temper, the views and moral judgments with which Britain was prosecuting the war at a time when its issues, though certain to ourselves, appeared doubtful to many foreign observers. It seems better to leave them to speak as from the days when Englishmen were bewildered by the doctrines as well as the behaviour of their enemies, and were seeking explanations of what was so new to their experience. The clouds are now beginning to lift. Already we understand some features of the conduct and mental attitude of the enemy better

* *Essays and Addresses in Wartime*, by James Bryce (Viscount Bryce). (Macmillan, 6s. net.)

than we did three or four years ago. Happily that which we most desired has come to pass. This is a War of Principles, and the course of events has vindicated the principles of morality and humanity that were at stake.

This preface is supplemented by a "prefatory note" to the essay on "Neutral Nations and the War." In that essay, written soon after the outbreak of war, Lord Bryce, after stating that the war "has called the attention of the world outside Germany to certain amazing doctrines proclaimed there, which strike at the root of all international morality, as well as of all international law, and which threaten a return to the primitive savagery when every tribe was wont to plunder and massacre its neighbours," adds, "I do not for a moment attribute them to the learned class in Germany, whom I respect, recognising their immense services to science and learning; nor to the bulk of the civil administration, a body whose capacity and uprightness are known to all the world; and least of all to the German people generally." That was the view that Lord Bryce held four years ago. Writing in October, 1918, he confesses that the events of the war have changed his view. "It is difficult now to cling to the hope expressed in 1914 that the principles avowed by the German Government and put in practice by its High Command were held by only a small minority of the nation." After all allowances have been made for the excitement of a great crisis and the manufacture of opinion by a Government which fed the peoples with lies:

After every allowance has been made, it remains a marvel that in a nation like Germany so few of the leaders, in learning, science, education, and, above all, in religion, should have been found bold enough to condemn, and so many ready to defend, crimes which some at least among them must have known, and which would have shocked the generations of Kant and Goethe and Schiller, of Savigny and Schleiermacher and Neander. What has become of the nation's conscience? The explanation sometimes given that the university teachers and the clergy of the churches recognised by the State are in bondage to the Government does not suffice. There must have been some other cause at work to produce this callousness. Patriotism itself must have been perverted by false teachings and bad examples.

Lord Bryce feels that the miracle of retrogression into savagery has taken place since 1870. It is possible to disagree with that view. The conduct of the Prussian armies, though bad enough in 1870, was far worse in 1814; and the savagery of German troops in the present war is of about the same level of obscene cruelty as the conduct of German troops in the days when zu Pappenheim gloated over the smoking ruins of Magdeburg. Opportunities for evil do not make men evil, but they prove what men are. A century of steadily progressive prosperity has tested the German character, and we see the results to-day in every quarter of the globe. In England the deplorable environment created by the Industrial Revolution has been a force for evil during the same century, but it has certainly not resulted in destroying the character of

Englishmen and Englishwomen, nor their reputation for kindness and justice.

Lord Bryce, in his essay on "The War State: Its Mind and Its Methods," and in his Presidential address in 1916 to the British Academy, indicates "some of the influences which may have engendered this extravagant nationalism and sown the seeds of the moral decline which makes the new Germany unlike the old." The essay is a fearful indictment of the German Government and of the German troops. It is useless to repeat here these burning words which bring home the murder and torture of civilians, the outraging of women, the deportation of thousands of men and unprotected girls "torn from their homes and carried off to Germany to be set to forced labour there, some of them, no doubt, destined to experience an even worse fate." Lord Bryce points out that the evidence of fugitives was confirmed by diaries in German found on dead German soldiers, and that the German Government never denied though it endeavoured to justify these horrors. And the slaughter of the Armenians to the number of at any rate 600,000 has to be added to the tale of German crimes. "The German Government knew what was going on. . . . But no step was taken to arrest the hand of the destroyer. Instead of arresting it, they have honoured the two chief criminals with many compliments. . . . They made themselves accessories, whether before the crime or after the crime, to the most awful catastrophe that has ever befallen a Christian nation." Lord Bryce thinks that the explanation is the history of Prussia, which since 1870 has dominated and moulded Germany. The worship of War coupled with the worship of the State has created a species of national monomania. And again in his Presidential Address of 1916, Lord Bryce declares that "knowledge increases and wealth increases, but human nature has remained, in essentials, much what it was thirty centuries ago, and is never free from the risk of a relapse into the primal passions. Vanity and ambition may so possess a whole people as to suspend the control of reason."

There are certain assumptions in this argument that many students will reject. Is it more reasonable to suppose that since 1870 the German nation has gone mad than to prove historically that the nation was always the same, and only needed opportunities to reveal its real self? Lord Bryce declares that human nature is invariable, a proposition we venture to dispute, but assuming it to be true it is inconsistent with the doctrine of lapse into primal passions under conditions which are not primal conditions. The German is always a German. Whenever he has had a chance to plunder and rob, murder and outrage, he has done it, and his women folk have applauded him. That is the historic fact, and the chance came between 1864 and 1914. Human nature, however, is not the same. Races differ. The Germans are a race apart. They are fond of calling people cousins, but the percentage of German stock here at any rate is small. The population of this country is in the main of the same stock as it was before the Saxon and Jutish invasion. We were never Germanised, and now never will be. And the same is true of France.

Lord Bryce's discussion of the League of Nations is full of value. The central point of his system is an international Council of Conciliation to deal with those issues between nations, those questions of National Honour, which have always led to war. If we have an international rule of law, a tribunal to administer it, and a power to enforce its decisions, most difficulties of intercourse will be overcome; but a Council of Conciliation is needed for those fundamental issues which are regarded as non-judiciable. But there must be a Force capable of giving the Council of Conciliation time to do its work of conciliation. This force can only be created by a League of Nations. A penitent Germany would be admitted into the League, a Germany "regenerate in the spirit of its mind." There is not much sign of that spirit at present. Lord Bryce has hopes, which are not certainties but are not dreams, of such a League to Enforce Peace. It is necessary. "If we do not try to make an end of war, war will make an end of us." That is the real issue, and none can doubt that mankind will strive to meet it.

* * *

REBUILDING BRITAIN.*

Sir Alfred Hopkinson has performed a very useful work in putting into popular form, and in one volume, "Some general statement of the character of the varied problems which have arisen and of the principles which should guide in their solution" in the movement for national reconstruction which is the logical result of the war. Unless we solve these problems we might as well have lost the war: that is a common saying among reformers, and it contains a good measure of truth. But the solution cannot depend on the action of a few statesmen and politicians. The people at large must understand the needs of the time and the actual matters that have to be dealt with. The field of change is so vast that the average citizen, at any rate, cannot grasp the complex of movements unless an expert of the type of Sir Alfred Hopkinson, who has lived "a long and varied life engaged in law, politics and education," comes forward with some practical survey. He divides the problems under the old heads of "Peace, Retrenchment, and Reform," but certainly in no pacifist sense. Under the heading Peace he demands international peace through the machinery of a League of Nations, political peace based on constitutional principles ("the course of revolution in Russia should be a warning to all"), industrial peace springing from the action of industrial councils and the creation of an industrial life worth living, and religious peace, due to the co-operation of the various denominations.

In the matter of Retrenchment Sir Alfred looks to obtain efficiency as well as economy by a thorough revision of the executive, and also by the joint action of a Cabinet that takes a collective responsibility for

* *Rebuilding Britain: A Survey of Problems of Reconstruction after the World War*, by Sir Alfred Hopkinson, K.C. (Cassell & Co., Ltd. 5s. net.)

keeping down expenditure. A great Chancellor of the Exchequer can prevent extravagance, but new sources of revenue are needed. "Income tax, if levied on the present system, has touched the extreme limit. . . . The death duties, especially when a deceased person leaves a large family, already cause much hardship. A general increase in the existing rates of estate duty cannot be made without discouraging thrift." But Sir Alfred suggests that the State, in the case of intestacy, should take the whole property where the nearest relation was further removed than first cousin. Sir Alfred is in favour of an export duty on coal, and asks whether it would not be possible "to replace, at least to some extent, the excess profits duty, which cannot be permanent, by a duty on "excess dividends," that is, on the amounts paid out of the profits of a business for the use of capital above a certain percentage. "The excess profits duty, in spite of all its anomalies and the difficulties of assessment, has saved the financial situation during the War; a tax on excess dividends might 'save the situation' afterwards." But, after all, expenditure is almost as important as income. We are, and always have been, as the history of successive ages shows, a wasteful people, and Sir Alfred Hopkinson not only reveals the fact but shows us some of the ways out. Perhaps they are shown, however, best in the principles that must advance reconstruction which are pointed out in the first chapter: obedience to conscience, to duty, to love. Only by such means can we enter the great field of direct reform which Sir Alfred Hopkinson tabulates under twenty-nine heads, which involve first the restoration of a normal national life; secondly, the placing of government on an economical basis; thirdly, the provision of adequate revenue; fourthly, the creation of good industrial conditions and the recreation of country life, fisheries and forests; fourthly, the adequate development of education; and, lastly, the simplification of the legal machinery governing social life. It is a wonderful programme, set forth with that literary skill, that sense of humour and apt illustration, and that earnestness of purpose which make Sir Alfred Hopkinson a notable force in these days.

* * *

BELIEF AND FAITH.*

Dr. Bethune-Baker, in this very earnest work, defines a Christian as "one who trusts in Jesus as the Deliverer of the world, the Saviour of mankind, according to the will and purpose of God, appointed by Him to reveal that purpose, and to show the way in which it must be fulfilled: to be Himself in His own Person the potential fulfilment of it for all men." He goes on to tell us that however categories of thought may in changing fashion express the unchangeable fact of the Incarnation it has always

* *The Faith of the Apostles' Creed: An Essay in adjustment of belief and faith*, by J. F. Bethune-Baker, D.D., Lady Margaret's Reader in Divinity in the University of Cambridge. (Macmillan. 5s. net.)

been the claim of the Church, that "in all its Creeds and other formularies it was only expressing and safeguarding the primitive convictions of Christians, as they were reflected in the various books of the New Testament; new terms were used simply to sum up the sense of Scripture, in relation to new ideas, which seemed to run counter to the tradition." This, no doubt, is true, but it is rather difficult to apply it to the case where textual students, or what are known as higher critics have lost their faith "in the complete historical exactitude of the narratives of the Gospels." Dr. Bethune-Baker declares that "it is not impossible to read some of those narratives, not as exact representations in word of the thing that actually happened, but rather as interpretations of experiences that beggared description. When read in this way, they can and do become to men and women of to-day the medium of the same convictions of faith as they have produced when treated as literally historical." This attitude is likely to lead to difficulty. It is true to say of any narrative account of any event either to-day or at any past period that it is not "literally historical." It is not within the power of words either spoken or written, however honest and competent the witness may be, really to reproduce either by suggestion or verbatim report any particular situation, and the Gospel narratives share in this limitation. But it is unnecessary, as the divergencies of creeds among the really competent higher critics show, to grant more than this, and we venture to disagree when Dr. Bethune-Baker goes on to say that questions of miracles may be waved aside as merely of "scientific or antiquarian interest," and that "these are not questions on the answer to which the religious convictions of a Christian depend."

If specific statements set out in detail, and with full affirmation are dismissed as untrue, then the whole narrative is suspect, and there is no substantial historical basis on which to build. It is dangerous to dismiss as untrue facts such as the Virgin Birth and the resurrection of the body of the Lord. In the opinion of many highly competent thinkers, the narratives on these subjects have profound significance, and certainly the fact that certain theologians before the war were prepared to accept "Fichte's clever cut at God himself," and dispense with the historic basis of Christianity is certainly no reason why such an unhistorical course should be followed to-day, when we realise once again that there is no particle of the Gospel narratives that can be lightly thrust aside. Dr. Bethune-Baker contrasts "the religious construction" of each article of the Creed with "the literal construction," and pleads powerfully for concentration "on the religious values of the various articles." But surely religious values must depend on historical values in all ultimate matters. A great play has, of course, certain important religious values, and no doubt even if the record of Our Lord were merely a great invention, certain definite religious values would be connoted, but these would be of a totally different order to the religious values that

spring from the historicity of the narratives of the Birth and Life and Death and Resurrection of Our Lord. It is this profound distinction which, we venture to think, Dr. Bethune-Baker obscures in his admirable desire to keep within one fold all who are affected in their inner lives by the supreme idealism of the Gospel narrative, whether it is regarded as inspired literature or sober, though mysterious fact. We have no desire to limit freedom of interpretation, and do not intend to enter into the dispute between Dr. Bethune-Baker and the Bishop of Oxford, but we do stand for the rule that it is inadmissible to set aside one particle of the evidence contained in the New Testament in order to meet the intellectual difficulties of any school of thought. No doubt it is possible to adopt a "religious construction" which is not merely a "symbolic" construction of what the bulk of believers accept as historic facts. But the line is very fine, and is likely, in the hands of less able thinkers than Dr. Bethune-Baker, to lead to the negation of faith.

* * *

TALES OF THE SORBONNE.*

This little book of stories of student life in Paris will interest many readers. It is written in a fresh original manner, and deals especially with an English girl student whose ambition it was to study under the Professors at the Sorbonne. They gave her but scant encouragement, but at last she obtained permission to attend some of the classes. "You may come to my class on Sunday morning." "The favour so reluctantly accorded was no small one. The Sunday class was a unique experience to the student who had gained admittance to it."

The author, in the "Students' Tale," describes the manner and method of study under the professors of the Sorbonne; it is rather sad reading; the craving after learning, the ambition of knowledge for knowledge sake, the disappointments. After four years' hard study to be asked by one of the professors—"Mademoiselle, are you thinking of going on with your studies?" was far from encouraging, but with a very big lump in her throat she answered without hesitation in the affirmative, and at the end of five years obtained the much coveted ticket of educational efficiency. Will that proficiency stand her in good stead? Or is it in her case a mistaken profession from which neither she nor her pupils will reap true grain. There is nothing on earth so sad as an end gained—especially in educational efficiency—without the gift. Many may say, like Ruskin, that perseverance is the gift that makes for genius; it may, and undoubtedly does help, but the beginning and end of all education should be to discover the talent which is latent in all, so that the master may receive his own with usury.

Many of "the students'" reflections are interesting. Take the following:—

* *Tales of the Sorbonne*, by Rachel Fox. (Methuen. 2s. 6d. net.)

“One thing struck her with great clearness: it was the extravagant use of the human unit; who was fostered and trained by the State to be thrown away in early life, or in the prime of life, by the wheel of fortune. The waste seemed to her different from that in many countries: throughout Europe the tendency is to sacrifice, until they become human driftwood, the working man and woman earning one to four shillings a day, and then to provide for them. In France it seemed to her that the class sacrificed was the man and woman of education, who after thirty or forty years of toil, found themselves unable to withstand the pressure behind them. As children everything had contributed to help them up the first rungs of the ladder of Fortune—the hopes of parents, the appreciation in most cases of juvenile achievements, the excellence and the sequence of the teaching in the schools. There came a rude awakening for a large number of them when they found themselves among some hundred others contesting some dozen vacancies, each candidate being in the eyes of his own circle especially deserving of the recognition and rewards of the State. Some fell out; some kept on their course and found their positions seriously menaced twenty years later by younger competitors; a few, exceptionally gifted, reached early in life a place so high that competition could not touch them. This, then, was the fruit of equal opportunity, and the outcome of the noble efforts of a hundred years in France.”

One answers to this reflection, does the end justify the means? Are we English, as a nation, going to find a better means? The machinery is being set in motion for a fuller educational development; let us see to it that we avoid the pitfalls into which other systems have landed. The war has revolutionised almost everything; it is a new England come to birth with which we have to deal. Empires and systems fall, to be replaced, one trusts, with nobler aims and higher ideals. We must be true to our text, never forgetting what the nation has fought and bled for. The aim of education is for the well-being of a nation as a whole, and every unit should contribute to that end; if education does not help a man to discover himself, to him education has been a failure.

The remaining essays in this volume are devoted to character sketches of Parisian life, and very clever snapshots they are. The author is so familiar with the capital that the reader at once feels at home, a street or a quarter is in a few words brought vividly before his mental sight, all the little landmarks which are seen without effort come into prominence, and it is the same with the characters themselves. One seems acquainted with them at first sight, whether it be the professor or the student.

“A Red Cross Hospital” must appeal to anyone who has served therein, either at home or abroad, and “the student was fortunate in gaining admittance into the Ecole Normale of the rue D’Ulm, a college for scholarship students in times of peace, now transformed into a hospital of the Croix Rouge.” A welcome change one would think to the student from the dead bones of the past to the living needs of the present. All the little incidents of hospital life are noted, from the daily routine of the ward to the chatter of the patient who has put aside for a time the horrors of war—though he can talk

simply and vividly of his fighting experience—and whose mind is

“Engrossed with the designs of wool mats and the possibility of penny coloured newspapers. After several weeks or months he leaves the hospital with the truest compliment on his lips that if he is again wounded he hopes he may be able to return to the same ward and the same bed; and the doctors and nurses wish him *au revoir!*”

Enough has been said to show that this is a very interesting little book, and will not be lightly thrown aside when finished, for the reader who has read with open eyes will turn again to many a passage pencil-marked, with pleasure.

S. DE M.

* * *

THE CANADIAN CONSTITUTION.*

Mr. A. H. F. Lefroy, an eminent Canadian lawyer of English birth, is to be greatly congratulated upon this monumental work dealing with the constitution of the vast region which we call Canada. The subject is one of immense complexity, but Mr. Lefroy, by skilful use of the historical method and by invaluable lucidity of expression, has shown the reader the reasons for this complexity, and the actual constitutional problems which were so brilliantly solved by the passing in 1867 of the Imperial British North America Act. This Act brought into the Union or Confederation known as the Dominion of Canada the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Canada, that is to say Upper Canada and Lower Canada, which had been united in 1840 and under the new constitution were admitted to the Union as the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. British Columbia was admitted (by Order in Council) as a province in 1871, Prince Edward Island in 1873. In 1870 the vast North-West Territories were ceded to the Dominion by Order in Council under the Act of 1867. Out of these territories Manitoba was in the same year made a province, while Alberta and Saskatchewan were created provinces in 1905 by Dominion Acts made pursuant to an Imperial Act of 1871.

The written portion of the Constitution of this enormous land is to be found in the Act of 1867, supplemented or amended by further Acts of 1871, 1875, 1886, 1887, 1895, 1907, and 1915. Necessary modifications and means of growth thus have been secured, but as in England the efforts of the legislature have been supplemented by the Courts, and Mr. Lefroy reminds us that:

“Those great constitutional documents which comprise almost the whole of the written portion of the Constitution of Great Britain—Magna Charta, the Petition of Right, the Bill of Rights and the Act of Settlement—are equally included in Canada’s Constitution,

* *A Short Treatise on Canadian Constitutional Law*, by A. H. F. Lefroy, K.C., with an Historical Introduction by W. P. M. Kennedy, Department of Modern History, University of Toronto. (Toronto: The Coswell Company, Limited. London: Sweet & Maxwell, Limited.)

while as to the unwritten part of the Constitution, those legal decisions which embody the Common Law Constitution of Great Britain are equally authoritative in Canada, and we may say of both the Dominion and Provincial Governments that 'that great body of unwritten conventions, usages and understandings which have in the course of time grown up in the practical working of the English Constitution, and which are so admirably dealt with in Dicey's "Law of the Constitution," form as important a part of the political system of Canada as the fundamental law itself which governs the federation.'

But the Constitution of the Motherland has not the extraordinary complexities with which Canadian statesmen, assisted by wise thinkers on this side of the Atlantic, have had to deal. Mr. Lefroy summarises the Canadian position with remarkable clearness. The executive government and authority are vested in the reigning Sovereign, who, by and with the advice of responsible ministers, appoints a Governor-General, who governs by and with the advice of the Privy Council for Canada, which is for this purpose composed of the Ministry of the day. This Ministry is the product of the Parliament for Canada, consisting of the Sovereign, the Senate, and the House of Commons. Parliament must hold a session at least once a year. The 96 life members of the Senate are appointed by the Governor-General in the name of the Sovereign, 24 from Ontario, 24 from Quebec, ten from New Brunswick, ten from Nova Scotia, four from Prince Edward Island, six from Manitoba, British Columbia, Saskatchewan, and Alberta respectively. There is prerogative power to exceed this total by six and no more. Thus the Senate cannot be swamped for political reasons in the fashion possible in the case of the House of Lords. The relations between the Senate and the Commons are identical with those which existed in England between the House of Lords and the House of Commons previous to 1911. The Canadian House of Commons contains 221 members of which Quebec has always 65. The total number increases with population. The statutes passed may be disallowed by the Imperial Government at any time within two years but only one Statute, the Oaths Bill of 1873, has ever been disallowed. But this system, which is practically identical with the English, is complicated by the fact that each province has a legislature, and has a Lieutenant-Governor, who represents the King and not the Governor-General. Each province, as well as the whole Dominion, is a model of the English Constitution. The British system of Parliamentary cabinet-government exists in all the provinces as well as in the Dominion as a whole. "The framers of the scheme of Canadian Confederation sought to follow, as far as was possible under federal conditions the British model." And this constitution has proved amazingly successful. It was the product of a long period of probation. The brilliant historical essay by Mr. W. P. M. Kennedy, of the University of Toronto, with which this volume opens, makes this clear

enough. "Almost every step towards Canadian Confederation was taken in the light of past experience in constitution making in Canada." From 1763, when England had to deal with a conquered French Settlement, to 1863, when the last constitutional stage was reached, during this period of a century we see real statesmen at work. General Murray in 1764 and his successors, Carleton and Lord Dorchester, were men of high principle and character, who, in the earliest constitutional struggles, and in the dark hours of the American War saved her not only for the Empire but for herself. A "free Constitution" came in 1791 after proposals which foreshadowed the Federation that was to be born in 1867. No doubt dark days followed, but the coming of Lord Durham to Canada in 1838 opened a brighter era. His *Report on the Affairs of British North America* stands "among the greatest State-papers in British history." He claimed for Canada the Constitutional system of Great Britain, and he was loyally supported by Lord John Russell and Poulett Thomson, who became Lord Sdenham. The latter made the Act of 1841 a complete success, and his policy was pursued by his successor, Sir Charles Bagot. But it was Lord Elgin who made responsible Government in Canada a reality, and thus in 1858 Lord Durham's suggestion of a federated British North America came into the range of practical politics. The American Civil War clenched the argument. Union is strength. The proposal was received in England with "prodigious satisfaction," and the British North America Act became law.

It was a wonderful development. The seed of a united North America had germinated in days of darkness and winter storm, and then it burst forth in the spring, and to-day has given us fruits that no man could have prophesied. The Wise Men were wiser than they knew. They had carried an immense region of the earth through darkness to light. Mr. Lefroy tells us that the Act

"Is the most successful piece of constitutional legislation which has ever emanated from the Parliament at Westminster. Much of the credit of that success must no doubt be accorded to the men who have lived and worked under the system created by it—that sturdy blend of English, Irish, and Scotch, which forms the predominant element in the British Canadian provinces, whose staunchness and constancy is now winning recognition on the battlefields of Europe. But while making every allowance for this aspect of the matter, the fact remains that the more thought and labour one expends on the Constitution of Canada under our Federation Act, the greater grows one's admiration for the wisdom and prescience of those to whose constructive genius it is due."

We may go, indeed, further than this. The British Constitution is a work of racial genius, based probably on the subtle combination of Norman and English minds, and the force of that constitution is undying, being part of the spiritual heritage of every thinking Englishman and Englishwoman. It has impressed itself on the claim for political freedom throughout the

world, but it has reserved its chiefest manifestations for the Dominions, which hold their birthright from their Motherland. The growth of the Canadian Constitution was not other in spiritual significance than the upgrowth of constitutional life in South Africa, in Australia, in New Zealand. And in all these vast Dominions the principle of federation has been combined with that of balanced Parliamentary Government. The spirit that united British North America united the Australian States, the South African lands. The Mother of Parliaments has a certain eternity of influence which is only paralleled by the persistency of creative force that resides in the Roman and in the English law.

J. E. G. DE M.

SHORTER REVIEWS.

The Rev. J. H. Shakespeare in "The Churches at the Cross-roads" (Williams & Norgate, 7s. 6d. net) lays stress on the fact that "the cost of our advanced civilisation is very high. Payment has to be made for it at every stage in nerve and heart and brain"; that there is to-day an "awakening of a conscience for social service and of a resolve to secure a better chance for the poor, the weak, the disinherited"; that woman has achieved a new place in the social order. These outstanding features of our time are special problems for the modern church, and that church, "in its present divided condition," cannot solve them effectively. There must be a rebirth of the church. This church reborn must be instinct with conviction, "must understand the attitude and temper of its own time," must "take its part in solving the ills of society," must transcend Nationalism, must be a church militant. The Free Evangelical Churches have an essential unity in the conceptions of election, of spiritual fellowship and spiritual democracy. There is gain in the fact of denominationalism, but there is loss, too, in the fact of divisions which belittle the vital and emphasise the temporal. There the difficulty of united action, of divided supply, of training sphere and ideals in the ministry, of overlapping, of spiritual effort. "Is it either rational or Christian that in the typical English village there should be the Church of England, Baptist, Congregational, Wesleyan Methodist Chapels, and also a Primitive or United Methodist, or perhaps both?" The nation and the churches need, not union but unity, "the different parts of the one body" working together "in complete harmony of means and end without any collision or frustration of the life force, each organ fulfilling its function and answering to its own type." Such unity is not merely unity of social service, intercommunion, mechanical inter-organisation, uniformity. It is the "unity of a living body." So we must have federation of the Free Churches and corporate union with the Church of England. Catholicism and Puritanism each have contributions "of incalculable value to make to the other." Mr. Shakespeare adds, "It is no use concealing my conviction that reunion will never come to pass except upon the basis of episcopacy. I did not think so once, but that was simply because I did not understand it." Of course he does not mean episcopacy as a political instrument, but the episcopacy of the Early Church. It is the spirit and temper of unity that

will solve the question; Christian charity on all sides. Then there will be that unity of church life which will conquer the world.

* * *

Mr. J. W. Jeudwine, in his volume "The Foundations of Society and the Land" (Williams & Norgate, 18s. net), gives us a review of the social systems of the Middle Ages in Britain, their growth and their decay: with a special reference to land user, supplemented by some observations on the connection with modern conditions. It is a bold and broad-minded review of the highly articulated developments which have given us so many modern social problems. Mr. Jeudwine tilts wisely and well against the teaching of history in schools to-day. "It is not only deadly dull, but it is totally without moral atmosphere." Mr. Jeudwine rightly denies the position adopted by one such book that "the central position of English constitutional progress has always been the control of the purse by Parliament," and declares that the "central positions" of the constitution are "(1) that it is unwritten custom easily modified to suit changing conditions; (2) that its success is dependent on a due adjustment of hereditary and effective elements, on perpetual compromise between naturally opposed forces; (3) that the checks by either one or the other have hitherto proved so effective that with rare exceptions neither element has dared to put the other to final trial; and (4) that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." Mr. Jeudwine declares that the school teaching of history is not based on first principles, and that ages of transition are treated as "ready made." So here we are shown a good deal of the social life of the Middle Ages; feudal society is contrasted with communal society, English tenures of land with the Norse tenures of the Orkneys and Shetlands, which had certain resemblances to the Borough English tenure. In the chapter on these Norse tenures Mr. Jeudwine speaks of the migration of the Angles to England as the "movement of a whole people." This is a very disputed question. The migration never displaced the native Briton as the types which survive show, and the number of Angles and Jutes who came here has probably been greatly exaggerated in view of the fact that their tongue stamped out Latin and various British dialects. The Teutonic element was absorbed by the Celtic element. On the other hand, the later Danish element maintained its individuality, and does so to this day. The account of the Waste will be found interesting. It is, of course, a very technical subject from the legal and historical point of view; but it is here chiefly dealt with from the practical and agricultural aspect. The process of turning waste into arable still goes on, and many of the agricultural methods of the Middle Ages survive. Mr. Jeudwine seems doubtful whether any of the old herds of wild white cattle (a prehistoric beast) survive. They do certainly, though some have been scattered in recent years. There are still plenty of wild horses and wild deer in England, but the wild swine have disappeared. The wild cat still exists in Scotland, and apparently on the Marches of Wales. This book is crammed with interesting material, is very controversial in parts, and very stimulating, and certainly should be studied by all land reformers to-day, since the early Middle Ages has much to teach us in the way of the communal life which seems to be coming again.

* * *

Mr. Hartley Withers in this important pamphlet on "The League of Nations: Its Economic Aspect" (Oxford University Press, 3d. net), declares that "if there is a League of Nations the answer will be Production. If not, Destruction." In other words, if there is no

League we must continue to produce for destructive purposes, while if there is a League—a *real* League—then the forces of the world can be devoted without undue competition to increase “the supply of good food, good clothes, good houses, cheap travelling facilities, good teaching, and that freedom from anxiety about the means of life which makes people more likely to be kindly and considerate in their treatment of one another.” Now the war has shown us “in the first place that when man gives his energies to the task of destruction he makes a call upon them which is insatiable in its demands; and, in the second, that those energies of his have been able to meet the call to an extent which was undreamt of, because man knew not how hard or how well he could work, until the stimulus of this war made him put every available ounce into facilities for mutual slaughter.” In the same way, if we have learnt by experience, the principle of unity of effort can take us “to a new and much higher level of material prosperity—a higher and more widely-diffused intellectual development, a truer appreciation of beauty, and a great improvement in the general standard of conduct, and in the relations of man to man in the ordinary affairs of life.” But all depends on the increase of material supplies. The physical basis of things must be set right before we can build the spiritual ladder. Jacob’s ladder was based on earth, that ladder on which angels *ascended* and descended. We expect that Mr. Withers will agree with this deduction from his economic point of view. If there is no League and the demand for armaments is maintained and increased, international trade will dwindle and the likelihood of war will check foreign investments, while panics and alarms would become endemic. When the threatened war comes, if it ever comes again, “its destructiveness seems likely to wipe out most of the patiently achieved successes—such as they are—of our present civilisation.” But if the League is a reality “a great increase of international trade might well be expected, and a world-wide development of production assured.” The rivalry between nations would be a rivalry in the degree of happiness of the respective peoples, “not only prosperity but educated intelligence and some opportunity of a really noble life.”

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Mr. Edwyn Bevan’s name on the title-page of a book is a pledge of sound scholarship and independent judgment, whether his theme be the ancient or modern world. His latest volume, “German Social Democracy during the War” (George Allen & Unwin), will be read with peculiar interest at a time when the control of German politics has, at any rate for the moment, passed into the hands of the Socialists. His narrative begins with the action of the party during the closing days of July, 1914, traces the growing divergence between the Majority and the Minority, narrates the open split between the two sections, and closes with the appointment of Hertling to the Chancellorship. The story is told with admirable temper, and the protagonists are allowed to explain their views in their own words. Though the outside world knows only of the Majority, the Minority, and the tiny group led by Liebknecht, our author reminds us that this classification is incomplete, and that one or two men occupied a position on the extreme right which was not far removed from Pan-Germanism. No one can close this admirable little book without having a clearer idea of the personality and opinions of such men as Scheide-

mann, Haase, David, Ebert, Bernstein, Liebknecht, Lensch, and others who are now playing such a prominent part on the stage of the new Germany.

* * *

Baron Heyking, the former Consul-General in London, speaks with authority on Russia; and his new book, "Problems confronting Russia" (King & Son, 10s. 6d.), deals with many aspects and problems of the political and economic life of that country. Several of the essays have already appeared in print, and taken together "they form a whole which is throughout an appreciation of the evolution of Russia and of the continuation and further development, of close friendly relations between the two countries." The author is an outspoken enemy of the Bolsheviks, though, like all patriotic Russians, convinced of the necessity of far-reaching reform; the economic chapters are, however, of greater interest and novelty than the political. That on Russia's economic resources with special reference to British industrial and commercial opportunities, was read to the Statistical Society, and deserves diligent study, since it contains not only a mass of information but shrewd practical advice. The chapter on the potentialities of Russo-Indian trade may be regarded as a pendant, and is equally useful. "The Baltic Problem" provides a clear account of the past and present of the Baltic Provinces, now separated from Russia and destined to an independent, or at any rate autonomous life. Baron Heyking is a master of English, and his knowledge of both countries gives weight and interest to his reflections and proposals.

* * *

Mr. Leonard Reid has written a book which deserves attention, not only during the excitement of a general election, but in the calmer days that lie beyond. "The Great Alternative: Sane Politics or Revolution" (Longmans) summons men and women to face the main problems of reconstruction in a bold democratic spirit. The book is short enough to be read in a couple of evenings; but the author presents his advice in lucid language, and no reader can fail to catch his drift. "My first object is to call attention to the necessity of building up the balancing force of moderate but sturdily progressive opinion. I preach the case for a great New Liberalism." The New Liberalism takes over a great deal from the old, including unwavering adherence to Free Trade. Among the recent schemes for the reform of our industrial machinery he selects for special approval the Whitley Committees; and not the least merit of this vigorous and persuasive little volume is the reprint of the Whitley Report as an Appendix. Co-operation is the key to the better world towards which we are striving—co-operation between nations, between classes, between churches, between capital and labour.

* * *

Under the title "German Designs on French Lorraine: the Secret Memorandum of the German Iron and Steel Manufacturers" (George Allen & Unwin, 6d. net) we have the text of the secret memorandum "addressed at the close of 1917 by the Association of German Iron and Steel Manufacturers and the Association of German Iron Masters to the Imperial Chancellor, Count von Hertling, and to Field Marshal von Hindenburg. It is a plea for the annexation to Germany of that part of Lorraine which was left to France in 1871, and some districts of which—more particularly the Longwy and Briey district—are very rich in high-grade iron ores." This small book deals with certain misstatements in the Memorandum—understatements—as to the wealth of iron ore in

Germany and—overstatements—as to the wealth of France. Germany had before the war free access for trading purposes to the French coal fields, and controlled 16 per cent. of the coal area, and so abused the freedom that precautionary measures had to be taken. "The Secret Memorandum not only demonstrates that the annexation of the mining districts of French Lorraine would place Germany in the most favourable position for renewing the European War, but also that the German Empire would never have been able to undertake the present war, or to carry it on for a long time, if it had not been in possession of Alsace-Lorraine." German schemes to regain a monopoly of the iron area will be formed in due course, but it is to be hoped that the terms of peace will discount all such schemes, and make the German iron and coal areas securities for the payment of the costs of the war.

* * *

In "Germany in Defeat: A Strategic History of the War" (Kegan Paul, 7s. 6d. net) Count Charles de Sousa has now reached the "fourth phase," in which he deals with "Secondary Theatres," and also discusses various questions of policy such as the German policy at sea, the policy which largely annulled the effects of the Franco-British victories of 1916-17 and so forth. The doctrine of unity of command is not set forth at length here as the principle of victory, but it is pointed out that the declarations of Statesmen should have been in more fitting accord with the tasks and objects of the military leaders. To secure that, we take it, was the first step towards unity of command.

* * *

The poetry and philosophy of Sir Rabindranath Tagore have taken a considerable hold on the West, and in this bulky volume on "The Philosophy of Rabindranath Tagore" (Macmillan, 8s. 6d. net) Professor S. Radhakrishnad of Maharajahs' College, Mysore, says that in interpreting his philosophy "we are interpreting the Indian ideal of philosophy, religion, and art, of which his work is the outcome and expression." No doubt in this case, as in the case of Robert Browning, the prose interpreter runs risks when he attempts to convert "the vague suggestions of the poet into definite statements, supply the premises, draw out the conclusions, and give the setting where necessary." But this danger is at any rate condoned here, since Sir Rabindranath "has been pleased to express his appreciation of this interpretation of his philosophy." The lovers of the poet will therefore turn with interest to this book.

* * *

In "A Handbook for Speakers on a League of Nations" (George Allen & Unwin, 1s. 6d. net) the League of Nations Society has gathered together a mass of information on the menace of militarism, the causes of wars, on various forms of international union, on the methods of keeping international peace, on the doctrine of sanctions, on the history of the whole subject (with documents) which will prove useful to students of a great subject. "The sanctity of treaties can only be secured by a League of Nations that will furnish itself with the apparatus required for adjudicating upon contracts made between its members, and will undertake to provide the force that may be wanted to compel a defaulter to keep his word." Anything less than this is useless and perhaps dangerous.

OWING to the increased cost of paper and printing the Editors are reluctantly compelled to raise the price of "The Contemporary Review" to 3/- per copy. To ensure copies readers are requested to place their orders beforehand with a bookseller or newsagent.

THE GENERAL ELECTION—AND AFTER.

THE Armistice had concluded the long nightmare of Death. It came suddenly and almost unexpectedly. It was received with universal rejoicing by all classes and parties. A few weeks ahead was coming the historic home happiness of Christmas, with its message to earth of Peace to men of good will. The intervening period was chosen by the Government and its newspaper allies to force the country into a General Election. A Parliament, it was stated, must be elected which would govern England for the next few years. And such a Parliament has been elected; under such conditions and of such composition as this country has never seen before and will possibly never see again.

The study of such methods and anticipation of such results may be not uninteresting. To complain of them is foolish. To raise ineffectual protest against a *fait accompli* is an evidence only of weakness. It may not be without profit, however, for some of those who have first-hand knowledge to set down, for the use of future historians, with such impartiality as is possible, how the thing was done.

Let us suppose, therefore, a visitor from Laputa or traveller "from the fixed stars" with some knowledge of British politics, surveying, not without the humour of detachment, the paradoxes of this curious incident in British history. He would find that four-fifths of the electors loathed the very idea of an election at this time, and especially an election before "the boys" came home. He would find that the other fifth were filled with fierce bitterness at what they regarded as unfair fighting; that organised Labour, battered down beneath the hatches, were furious with indignation and threatening reprisals outside Parliament; that the Unity of the Nation which had accomplished the Armistice was suddenly split from top to bottom. So far, indeed, from the "Unity of the Nation" having been preserved, he would find (according to the detailed analysis of *The Times* newspaper) that the anti-Coalition

minority polled only a few hundred thousand votes less than the Coalition majority; and that if the votes in Ireland are counted the numbers would be practically equal. And so far from increase in "moral force" being achieved by the forcing of a General Election, the British delegates will have behind them not, as before, a practically united Parliament and people, but only the actual endorsement of something like 30 per cent. of an electorate of some nineteen millions of voters—male and female; which alone, on a new register, took the trouble to vote for their persons and policies. He would note, however, as remarkable events, the complete destruction of two historic parties in Parliament. The one is the Irish Constitutional Party, replaced by a violent, enthusiastic Republican force full of vigour and energy and willingness for self-sacrifice. The other is the historic Liberal Party. On expressing his desire to know the meaning of these things he would learn (not without astonishment) that a Prime Minister (passionately declaring himself a Liberal) had carefully arranged the political assassination of his old colleagues and of most of the Liberals who had loved him and honoured him in the days gone by. The assassination seems to have been effected in the main by a series of "coupons" (as they were called in the popular Press) by which Mr. Lloyd George issued signed commands to local Liberals in Liberal constituencies to vote against the sitting Liberal member and for the local Conservative candidates. Some of these "coupons" were used to assassinate young Radical candidates who have never been in Parliament and could have committed no offence there: many indeed being personal admirers of the Prime Minister. But by the carrying out of some bargain, still obscure, the very Liberal seat itself, which had voted Liberal perhaps for four elections, was thus swung over to some equally obscure Tory candidate, the Prime Minister's caucus here playing much the same part in the transaction as the German Staff who handed over without resistance the great German battleships to the British Navy. But for the most part he would find that, like the walrus of historic fame, they sorted out (perhaps without "the sobs and tears") "those of the largest size." It is said that in one such conference of Tory Tadpole and Liberal Coalitionist Taper, each emerged equally exultant, Mr. Tadpole confiding to his followers: "The man's a fool, he actually gave us seats which we should never have had the cheek to claim"; and that Mr. Taper reported to his friends: "It's all gone well; there will be no independent Radical or Labour men in my district."

In any case, such tactics proved effective. No "coupons" were issued against a Tory candidate. And the general result is that in a world sweeping towards Democracy a Tory majority unprecedented in the history of modern politics is left to cope with social unrest and universal Labour upheaval.

Many of the victims were advanced Radicals whose hair had grown grey in work for all progressive causes, who had supported the active conduct of the war, who had worked day and

night to pass Mr. Lloyd George's historic Budget, who had attempted to allay the immense early hatred of the Insurance Act, who had rallied round him in Marconi time, when his present colleagues were hot and eager for his political destruction. If the observer inquired what could have produced such strange tactics, he would learn that the leader of the Tory Party had announced that Mr. Lloyd George is "a changed man," and that the Prime Minister had announced that the Tories are a changed Party. And with such explanation, he would be left to go away.

Some pleasant incidents accompanied this Election. When the Franchise Bill passed the Commons, no greater enthusiasm was shown than for the proposition that all the soldiers should vote, and especially those abroad. In the actual election normally not one in three—often not one in four—or less, returned their ballot papers; and these in the main not from the fighting armies abroad but from men in quieter quarters, far from the fighting line. And even of this deplorable minority many showed their protest in appropriate language against elections at such a time. "Not till demobilisation," "After we come home," "To hell with both of you!" and other more violent expressions were (I am informed) freely scrawled over the ballot papers. Many candidates received letters from their old supporters in France couched in such terms as: "Don't you worry about this election—we'll settle up the job all right, when we come home."

He would learn also that fierce debates took place in the passage of the Bill on the question of soldiers in distant places; and that those who pointed out the absurdity of the "proxy" system—unless the election was postponed six months—were denounced as pro-Germans and enemies of the soldiers. He would learn that in actual fact the hundreds of thousands of soldiers in Egypt, Vladivostok, in the cold of Archangel and the Murman Coast, the great fighters that broke into Bulgaria, all the British troops who took part in the amazing adventure of the Palestine campaign, the heroes of Mesopotamia and Bagdad—were never given a chance even of "proxy" voting; that "proxy" voting under such conditions was an ignoble farce; that the constituencies which received fifty proxy voters were proud of their efficiency, and those who received five were not unsatisfied.

But our visitor would be impressed by the enormous nature of the Government victories. Members were ejected by ten, fifteen, or twenty thousand votes. One who lost by two or three thousand would receive the hearty congratulations of his friends. And he would ask to be allowed to see an election actually at work—the crowds demonstrating in vast multitude for the Government and the man who won the war; the great speeches, the enthusiasm, the good-humoured but effective trampling down of all opposition, the flags, the processions, the cheers for the men who made the Peace and were going to bring back prosperity. So he might be introduced to an electioneering campaign in a typical East London election. The Town Hall and all other possible halls

have been commandeered by various "controllers" of the Government. The candidates hold tiny meetings in little schoolrooms to which tramp through muddy, darkened streets a few score or a few hundred enthusiasts. The Tory or Coalition candidate held the record with an audience of seven. But there were plenty of meetings of fifty, one hundred, or a few hundred of listeners in an electorate of 31,000. Deprived of accommodation the candidates took to the streets, where for the whole time scattered gatherings of a few hundred persons could be seen, seemingly in utter indifference, gazing on the gesticulating orators from either side with an appearance of apathy and disgust, and above all of an enormous weariness. The Liberal candidate held six open-air meetings a day, and one Saturday a central open-air Committee with relays of speakers from three till nine. But the men were tired of perpetual overwork, and the women for the most part indifferent, and the rain fell continuously, alike on just and unjust. And even when the band of the Discharged Sailors and Soldiers marched to the Liberal meeting, and played popular tunes, the audience was never more than a fraction of the audience which would have assembled in past political fights. In larger meetings questions were frequent, advanced mainly by a small and indefatigable group of Labour men who read the *Daily Herald* and derive fresh access of enthusiasm from Albert Hall meetings. But they were not questions upon political programmes; none on Social Reform or the new earth and heaven which each Party promised to produce in almost identical terms. The shortness of paper reduced political appeals and leaflets (which the women might have read at home) to the lowest possible dimensions, and the sole guide to enlightenment for the bulk of these women were the Sunday papers—and especially the Sunday picture papers. The only other literature were various brewers' carts and lorries of the Tory candidate's business which jogged sadly through the rain plastered with requests to vote for X and Mr. Lloyd George; with a very small X and a very large Lloyd George. No appeal appeared for the other member of the Duumvirate: "Vote for X and Mr. Bonar Law." But Mr. Bonar Law's name, with all the amiable qualities such a name suggests in Parliament, is not one to conjure with in East London. Many voters were entirely under the impression that in voting for X and Mr. Lloyd George they were voting for the complete destruction (now that the war was over) of the Tory Party in East London. And there were few "workers" on either side to liven up meetings or canvass electors. Of the workers who worked so splendidly in former days—hundreds of them for each committee-room—the majority were away serving abroad, or lie for ever silent in the vast cemeteries of France and Flanders.

The kind of questioning carried on in open-air meetings always gives some indication of the temper of the people. The crowd often sauntered from a Tory meeting to a Liberal meeting in close proximity, so there was no case of picked audiences. The

first and general impression was of disgust at the election being held now: in the darkness, on confused issues, before they could really appreciate the positions and programmes of Parties—above all, before the “boys” come home.

Both the candidates were handicapped by this anti-election feeling: they were supposed somehow to be involved in the guilt of it, or to have been able to avoid an election now, or at least in this particular division, if they had refused to stand. But whole streets of men and women—and especially the women—refused to vote, and thus reduced the total poll—on a new and accurate register—to something less than 45 per cent. of the electorate. The great bulk of the questions were on the hastening of demobilisation, and the persistently indignant one: “Would the candidate support the immediate withdrawal of our troops from Russia?” In fact, demobilisation and the Russian withdrawal, and “Is the candidate against conscription?” were three certain queries. Wives desired their husbands home, and mothers their sons, with a kind of passionate longing. The Coalition scales dipped for a moment and were on the way to a big downfall when Mr. Lloyd George announced that abolition of conscription here was dependent on abolition of conscription abroad. If that statement had been maintained for two weeks the Coalition would have been swept out of power. But the clever men who ran the Coalition campaign insisted on immediate repudiation, and unconditional repudiation of conscription in any shape or form appeared in the next day’s newspapers. It may be argued that conscription is good or evil, necessary or unnecessary. But three years’ experience of it has sickened all classes of it. In nine out of ten working-class districts any candidate advocating conscription would find a millstone round his neck, ensuring his destruction.

For the rest, no questions were asked about Ireland, although Ireland is the storm-centre of Europe, nor for or against Free Trade, Dumping, Imperial Preference or Tariff Reform. Such questions were asked as: “When can we have this League of Nations which we are longing for?” “Is the candidate in favour of President Wilson’s fourteen points?” And after the reply, “Oh, that’s good!” another woman questioner: “Does the candidate think it fair, their making our boys sign on for four years more compulsorily?” “No, but it isn’t compulsory.” “Yes, it is, when the commanding officer asks you to sign on—it is compulsory.” “Will he oppose endowment of motherhood and pay our men a proper wage? We don’t want their inspectors when we are having our babies here” (this received with general approval by the women present). From the Socialist element: “We don’t want conscription for them to do as Briand did in France.” “Are they going to send the German prisoners back, or are they going to keep them to break strikes?”

There did not seem so much “Kaiser hunting” in East London as we are told occurred in other districts. The candidate was never asked whether he would advocate his trial, or even his execution.

If his name was mentioned it was generally followed by interjections. But they were not the fierce fury of a French audience, but the more or less jolly expression of the unconquerable humour and tolerance of the British working man. "Drown him!" "Hang him!" "Put him in the dust destructor!" "Sink him in his own submarines!" and the same type, from a race extraordinarily difficult to keep vindictive when the war is over and they have attained an unprecedented victory.

The promise of the Prime Minister (as interpreted in East London) that Germany shall be made to pay for all the cost of the war awakened far more enthusiasm and undoubtedly influenced many voters. It struck their sense of humour that all the pensions and disability allowances—fifty or a hundred millions a year—should be paid out of German money. They liked to think that the German working man will be working overtime to pay off all our national war debt; that the *Lusitania* and other thousands of the mercantile marine and the liners which have been torpedoed and all the great battleships lost, and the little destroyers, and (on land) all the cost of destroyed khaki and barbed wire and Ticklers' jam will be paid by German gold or German labour or Germany's goods and food and raw material. They care—many of them—little for the reconstruction of the Balkans or the cutting up of far countries with unpronounceable names. But if and when the Prime Minister comes back from the Peace Conference with immediate payment or payment of all the cost of the war by Germany guaranteed by the Peace Conference, he will find himself the most popular statesman, in England and the Empire, that the world has ever known.

What of the "Future" of a "Parliament" produced under such conditions? Here all writers are in the hands of romantic conjecture. And the man who would attempt to prophesy would rightly be branded as a fool. I have heard it said that Government by a Dictatorship responsible not to the people but to a Parliament as thus elected will break up simply for want of cohesion. I do not for a moment believe it. The more the world sweeps towards Democracy outside, the more the Tory majority will huddle together beneath the blanket of the Coalition. More than three-quarters of them never expected to get in or to return to Parliament. If Mr. Lloyd George nibbles away at their vested interests in progressive legislation they will surrender, shedding some natural tears, but drying them soon. For the only alternative to giving some "ransom" is (in their vision) the fiery furnace of a Bolshevik Labour Ministry which (they think) would take it all. But, as a matter of fact, they are little likely to be severely troubled. The brewers, the railway directors, the coal-owners, the landowners will find, when the bargain is concluded, little dissatisfaction with the terms: for the State will come in to grease the wheels of these transactions. Mr. Lloyd George has a magnificent

opportunity of producing dazzling transactions out of State money now pouring into the Treasury coffers.

Treasury control has completely vanished. Some of the ablest of its permanent officials fought heroically for its maintenance, but they always fought a losing cause. There will be hundreds of millions pouring into the country for the sale of the almost limitless accumulation of the apparatus of war: motor cars, uniforms, mountains of food and fodder, vast buildings, dumps, and every conceivable material which life requires for living. What more natural—what more popular—than the interception of these hundreds of millions from the Consolidated Fund? And what (again) more popular than the irrigating influence scattered through the country—in the building of the promised new million houses, in increasing pensions and disablement allowances (many still scandalously low), in settling soldiers on the land with a “fair price” to the landowner—paid in cash, says Lord Lee—in public works, assumed to be useful to inland towns, which in any case those towns will welcome for the expenditure of the Government money, thus freely supplied? Interest is rapidly shifting from the region which was once Austria and Hungary to the problem of low wages and high prices at home. It can be kept going, for a time, with gorgeous results. And for many years the inevitable “Deluge” may thus be stayed.

The only dangers which I can at present discern before the present Dictatorship are three. The first is the possible desertion of the great Newspaper Syndicates. As I write the names of the new Government are being greeted with a storm of anger and contempt by the newspapers which made the Coalition: so one supposes either that they were not consulted in the matter or that the Tory majority exacted its full pound of flesh. However, the Prime Minister has partially appeased them by the promise of drastic reconstruction in a few months; an agreement welcome to the three or four hundred odd who expected office, but received without enthusiasm by those transitory and embarrassed phantoms in office who never will know when the axe will fall.

The second is that a general organised strike of Labour, less on social than on political grounds, aggravated, perhaps, by the return of the soldiers, will bring the whole structure clattering to the ground. But in such a case the Cabinet would certainly “not hesitate to shoot”; with what results let those who have recommended shooting in the past, carefully estimate. The third danger comes from an island as far from this country as the long wash of Australasian seas, yet united to her by the bonds and hatreds of centuries—Ireland.

The policy of doles and ample public work and the subsidy of manufacture will certainly be attempted here. But the example of centuries has shown that this queer nation combines devotion to freedom and the ideal with all the peasant’s love of material gain. The time chosen for the election in Ireland was probably the most impossible: in a sort of No Man’s Land between war and peace; and with the shadow of conscription darkening the land and

(probably) about to become a reality in the week of the Armistice if the Armistice had not been signed. It has been said that the account of British and Irish relationships resembles less an intelligible record than the scrawling of a madman upon the pages of history. And as we read that account, as set down by a Lecky or a Swift, we pride ourselves that this after all is the story of things "done long ago," if "ill done too." But the story of these relationships from just before the war until to-day will be regarded in the detached view of the future as scrawlings no less insane than any of the past.

It began, indeed, before the war: when members of the present Government and the majority which surround them fomented organised armed rebellion against the forces of the Crown. It continued through the connived at and unpunished gun-runners of the North and the shooting down of the gun-runners of the South; through the unpunished mutiny of the cavalry officers of the Curragh; up to the declaration of European war and the rejected offer of Mr. Redmond of Irish recruits for oversea and Irish volunteers to guard the coasts. After that the madness developed rapidly, like that of a drunken man slipping with increasing swiftness towards the abyss. The Home Rule Bill was placed on the Statute Book, an action pleasantly compared by Mr. Bonar Law with the German violation of Belgium and the tearing up of "a scrap of paper." It has lain there covered with cobwebs; it has lain there for over four years; it will probably lie there until the Day of Judgment. Then came the increasing series of follies which show that British statesmen, otherwise sane, often "are only mad nor'-nor'-west." The success of the recruiting campaign of the autumn of 1914, if properly conducted, might have sent all the youth of Ireland, singing, to the war. One wonders why the officials who deliberately engineered its failure have not yet been either imprisoned or hanged. Sir Edward Carson goes into the Cabinet, John Redmond refuses. It should have been both or neither. The bitter years pass, "self-determination" (blessed phrase!) is promised for Poland and places with outlandish names containing far bigger German minorities than the Ulster minority in Ireland. Nothing is done towards "self-determination" in Ireland. The years pass and the idealists of Dublin rise in a hopeless insurrection and their "leaders" are shot in gaol—so many per day. To the bulk of the Irish people, who disliked the uprising, they have become now saints and martyrs. Mr. Lloyd George undertakes the work of reconstruction and fails utterly, according to the Tory papers (of whose truth I know nothing), because he promised one thing to one Party, another to another. Then follow the last tottering steps towards complete ruin. Sir Edward Carson pops in and out of the Government with bewildering frequency: now a high official of State, now in Belfast to exhort his followers to continue to be ready for rebellion. Sinn Fein arises, at first inconspicuous. A "Convention" is set up, debates at length, and comes by a majority to a large measure of agreement. Its work and deliberation and Report is

immediately swept by the Government into the dustbin. The Government announce conscription in Ireland, and (later) an accompanying measure of Home Rule. Mr. Lloyd George declares passionately that he will "stand or fall" with the passing of such a measure simultaneously with conscription. A Committee sits to discuss the Home Rule measure, and after a few weeks commits suicide. Mr. Shortt is sent to Ireland on the generally accepted principle that English barristers can always rule well an Ireland altogether unknown to them. His methods and speeches somehow fail to stem the tide. Sinn Fein runs through the country like a prairie fire. An almost simultaneous announcement is made—semi-official—that conscription is going to be enforced immediately without Home Rule, and that a General Election is to be held. The Constitutional Party is smashed into fragments. John Dillon, their leader, who has been forty years in the House, and was far the most able Parliamentarian in it during the years in which I sat there, is called by Sinn Fein "The Englishman," and goes down in his old constituency with a four-thousand minority. The Election could not have been better timed for the greatest possible disadvantage to the British prestige in the Peace Conference. M. Clemenceau has declared that that Conference will listen to all the little nations, who before this august tribunal must make good their claims to nationhood. Ireland will be there, excluded from inside, yet always knocking at the door. The deepest prison cannot exclude consciousness of her presence; with a demand from more than three-quarters of the inhabitants of that little island it, and twenty millions of Irish descent scattered throughout America and the Dominions. If under the remodelling of the world out of its present chaos they may give nationhood to Jugo-Slavs—with large alien minorities who will hate their rule—or give self-government to Czecho-Slovaks with far greater national minorities than any proportion in Ireland, and if nothing is done towards self-government for Ireland, the British delegates may emerge with the loot of German colonies and the possible promise of gigantic indemnities; but they will emerge also with the deepening of the accepted tradition of British hypocrisy, amid the contempt of the civilised world.

So the life of man swings through the centuries—now pitiful, now passionate, always subject to the inexorable processes of change. The problems of peace leave no breathing space, but arrive in immediate succession to the problems of war. It is too early as yet to attempt to pierce the darkness of the future. Peace arises with no serene sunrise, but as the flare of an angry Dawn. Yet apart from Parties and Party intrigue, the great realities remain. To maintain the ideal, even if now shattered and broken; to bind up the wounds of our people; to work each so far as in us lies for all change which will bring real welfare to those who suffer disability, and especially for the benefit of the very poor; to endeavour to restore the conditions when England, as the home of liberty and democratic government, shone like a beacon light

among the nations of the world—these are ideals for which a man would do well to devote all the effort of his days. He will suffer frequent disheartenments, long time when the cause seems dead, continuous repulse by the embattled force of reaction. But he knows that these causes, with exultations and agonies as their aids, must surely triumph at the last. And in all his labour he will be gladdened by a knowledge and resolution: the knowledge that the killing is over, that no more slaughter of men and boys is required before the wrath of Moloch is appeased: the resolution “Never again. It shall never come again—by God’s Mercy—so long as the life of humanity endures.”

CHARLES F. G. MASTERMAN.

THE GENERAL ELECTION.

IN a system of representation and in its use at a General Election there are two distinct objects to be kept in view which are not necessarily incompatible, though under the system existing at present it appears impossible to attain both of these objects. The first is to obtain a clear and definite expression of the will of the nation on the general character of the policy to be adopted by the Government and the Legislature, especially with regard to certain matters of immediate importance and as to the man or group of men whom it desires to place in power.

In recent years the power of the Prime Minister has increased. He practically appoints and dismisses all the other Ministers at his will, and a General Election in effect settles who shall be Prime Minister. No doubt the main practical issue at the recent election was whether Mr. Lloyd George, having regard to what he had done and what he proposed to do, should or should not be Prime Minister. The verdict of the electors—that is, now, of virtually the whole nation—as declared at the polls, was perfectly clear and distinct, and it is certain that declaration did in fact express the national will. On that issue even the most independent candidates among those who were successful—though some of them absolutely declined to give any general pledges of support, and did not obtain, or even declined to accept, the “Coalition ticket”—spoke quite definitely, though they reserved the right of free action on any subject which might come before Parliament afterwards. The basis of democracy is the right of the nation as a whole to declare what the general policy shall be and who is to take the lead in carrying it out. The claim put forward by any section or class, which disagrees with the clear verdict of the majority, to represent the “democracy” is a denial of the whole basis of popular government. The millions of electors may be “mostly fools,” but you cannot carry on democratic government on that assumption. The present system of virtually universal suffrage and nearly equal electoral districts, as a rule each returning one member, does enable the national will to find definite expression as regards both the general policy to be adopted and the leader to carry it out.

The other object is quite different. It is that Parliament should be a real reflex of the mind of the whole nation, including the best exponents of different lines of thought, of the varied opinions held by considerable numbers in the country, that it should include the men of most ability and highest character who are ready to devote themselves to the public service and have earned the confidence of a considerable body of their fellow-countrymen. If parties exist, each party, each school of thought, should be represented in the House of Commons, roughly in proportion to its numbers outside.

A system which secures one of these desirable objects may be very far from securing both. The recent election proves that the

existing system, which has secured the first of them, has failed to secure the second.

It is clear that the House of Commons will not, under the present system of election, properly reflect the state of opinion in the country by the presence in it of a due number of the leading men representing all the different views on public questions which are held by large sections of the community. This object cannot be achieved without proportional representation. Unless such a system is introduced over fairly large areas a substantial portion of the electors are practically disfranchised. How, for example, can a Liberal of the old school go to the poll if the choice offered to him is to vote either for a "C.U." who advocates protection and believes the salvation of the country to depend on checking free imports, or for a member of the so-called "National Party" eager to intern or deport not only men who have been peaceable and useful naturalised citizens for many years, but also their wives of English birth whose sons have died fighting for England in the war. It will not assist him if a third choice is offered of some revolutionary Socialist whose sympathies are with the perpetrators of the hideous brutality which prevails in a large part of Russia and whose policy might be to introduce a like chaos into this country. He must abstain from voting at all.

Or, again, the choice for a Unionist elector who still believes in Free Trade, and also is convinced that Mr. Lloyd George is far the best man to lead the nation in these difficult times, may be between some frequenter of the local Conservative Club of whom he never heard before, who would prohibit all trade with Germany for fifty years, and a respectable and dreary nominee of the Liberal Club who repeats the old shibboleths by rote, but might warm a little in support of a proposal to shoot people in Belfast for too emphatically objecting to be deprived of their rights as citizens of the United Kingdom. A happy solution is said to have been in one such case where a husband and wife, anxious to exercise the new franchise and holding similar views, decided not to abstain but arranged to vote, one for the "Co. U." and the other for the "Opp. L.," though they both disliked both candidates. Another elector, probably the wife of a soldier, or a soldier on leave, struck out the names of both candidates and wrote "demobilisation" on the ballot paper with a large cross after it. It is certain the present system prevents Parliament from being fairly representative of the best brains of the nation, and that it will exclude many of those who could render it the best service.

In a great city—such as Manchester—can anyone, however he may rejoice at a Unionist victory, maintain that the return of two Labour members and eight Unionists without a single one marked either Liberal or Coalition Liberal represents the true state of political feeling in the city? Can anyone help feeling regret that a member of moderate views, prepared to give a reasoned support to the Coalition Government, who had for years rendered devoted service to the city and thoroughly understood its

needs, could not secure re-election? He was truly described by a leading and enlightened member of the other party as "the best member the city had known since Sir William Houldsworth," and he would have been returned with absolute certainty had there been a fair system of proportional representation for the whole city. Thousands of citizens who valued his work and agreed generally with his views were unable to vote for him, and compelled to choose either to give their votes to someone almost unknown, whose views and mode of expressing them they disliked, or else to abstain from voting. Splitting a city into small areas does result in the exclusion of the leading citizens as a rule from representing it.

Take, again, the position of an elector in East Fife. He might share the opinion held by many—probably most—Unionists that the exclusion of Mr. Asquith from the House of Commons is a real loss both to the House and to the nation. He might recognise Mr. Asquith's patriotic conduct and his high character, and admire the clearness, the force and dignity of his utterances, unrivalled in their literary form by any of his contemporaries, rarely surpassed by any speaker of former times, yet at the same time believe that the welfare of the country will best be secured by returning Mr. Lloyd George to power, convinced that his energy and determination have been a main factor in winning the war, and are likely to be most effective in securing a just peace and the carrying out of a wise programme for "reconstruction." He cannot give a vote signifying his dissent from the verdict of the nation with which he concurs, to prevent the rejection of a man whom in many ways he admires. In view of other issues involved he may feel bound to help to defeat a man whom he regards as an ornament to the House of Commons. With a system of proportional representation over a wide area, Mr. Asquith would have remained a member of the House, but it would not have prevented the carrying out of the will of the vast majority of the people that the present Prime Minister was to remain in power.

It is not only, however, the exclusion of the leading and best-known men of the minority which is to be regretted. The system of small areas with a single member undoubtedly results in the selection as candidates of men whose only claim is their activity in local Party politics, and often in the exclusion of those who have a wider outlook and have had the advantage of a broader education.

The greatest defect, however, in the new House of Commons is one which no system of election could have prevented, and the saddest thing about the present Parliament will be the absence of a due supply of young men fitted to serve the State in the future. Those who know our Universities well must, even before the war, have been impressed by the splendid type of young men who were issuing from them every year—men ready for useful service, eager to improve the conditions of life of their fellows. Physically and morally no finer type of noble youth has ever been seen. Names of many such will occur to everyone acquainted with the young men who had grown up since the opening of the present

century. The outbreak of war and their immediate response to the call of their country and of humanity revealed still more clearly the character of the men who would have been the natural leaders of thought and of political action in the second quarter of the twentieth century. Most of them have laid down their lives—no other loss in the war has been comparable with that. Can it be said that in the new Parliament there will be many men under 40 years of age of ability and character likely to provide the leaders in years to come? The election of 1895 brought into the House a large number of such promising young men—of military age. Lord Curzon was 36, Sir Edward Grey 33—twenty years ago, after a passage of arms between them, Mr. Labouchere remarked: "Those are the two cleverest young men in the House"—Mr. Lloyd George 32, Lord Robert Cecil 31, Lord Hugh Cecil 26. Where are their successors to be found? Before the war the answer could have been given.

If the new House of Commons is defective as a reflection of the nation and its thought and aspirations it is not the fault of the electors. They have shown that their first wish is to give approval and support to all those who were believed to have rendered effective help in carrying on the war. The most marked feature in the returns is the number of men who had seen active service appearing at the head of the polls, the complete defeat of those who had endeavoured to embarrass the Government and of those who appeared to put Party or other considerations before the great object for which the country has been striving—victory and peace.

Secondly, the electors have proved how little they care about old party cries and party distinctions, and that they value independence. The politicians of the clubs and the party press seem incapable of understanding the lesson. They still seem to think that the people attach importance to the question whether there are more "Co. L's" or "Co. U's" in the Government, that they care, for example, whether Mr. Fisher is a Liberal or a Conservative. His appointment is welcomed universally because he understands education and cares about it. So Mr. Prothero's appointment is approved, whatever his party label may be, simply because agriculture has been the subject of special interest and study to him and he is regarded as fitted to deal with it.

On the other hand, wherever it is thought that appointments have been made or continued on the ground of political influence, or that an "undesirable" who had done mischief to the country when in office had been promoted for fear he might be a mischievous critic of Government if left out, or still more if a heavy purse is the qualification for a place, the whole position of the Government and its chief becomes the subject of sharp criticism by those whose only wish is to see the country wisely and efficiently governed.

Take one or two actual cases to show what occurs as regards party claims. A meeting of working men and women—artisans, miners, factory workers, small shopkeepers—is crowded because they know their candidate personally, though he may never have

appeared on a political platform until this autumn; they give him a hearty welcome. He hates rhetorical flourishes, and begins a plain, straightforward talk. "I refuse to be called either a Liberal or a Conservative, because I disagree with the Liberals on two main points and also with the Conservatives on two main points. I have *allowed myself* to be called the Coalition candidate because I wish it to appear that the country is supporting the Government and the Prime Minister in the time of difficulty. I am quite free to oppose them on any question on which I may hold an opinion contrary to what they put forward. I give no pledges to anyone except to use the best judgment I can." Asked if he would vote for the internment or deportation of every naturalised German, and knowing of the popular outcry on the subject, he replies: "I met one the other day who has lived long in England and lost two sons fighting for us in the war. If the father were expelled from this country because he is a naturalised German, it would be scandalous." Party managers, holding independence to mean political ostracism, would no doubt predict disaster for such a candidate: the electors returned him by a majority of nearly 11,000.

In another constituency the attitude of the people at a meeting appears rather that of a jury considering a verdict than of partisans supporting their favourite. The candidate is an employer, the audience almost entirely working men and women. He expresses his admiration for the part taken by Mr. Lloyd George in bringing the war to a successful end, and his wish to give him general support, and then turns to speak for three-quarters of an hour on industrial questions, quietly, with evident knowledge of his subject gained from experience and careful thought. He is listened to carefully, respectfully, critically. There is no appeal to passion, but only honest argument with no attempt to gain applause or catch votes, yet he has evident sympathy with the needs and hopes of those whom he is addressing. Afterwards one of his supporters addresses the meeting. "I neither know nor care what Party label the candidate has, nor whether he has the 'Coalition ticket.' You electors are quite able to select your own man without help from London. Do you, after hearing the candidate and knowing him, care—as the great Duke of Wellington used to say—one 'tuppenny damn' whether or not he has the ticket or whether he is marked 'Co. U.' or 'Co. L.,' Conservative or anything else? (Cheers.) Vote on the merits, never mind the label." Result of election, a majority of over 5,000 for the candidate whom the press afterwards classified as "Unionist opposition."

The election has, indeed, been fruitful in apparent paradoxes. Admittedly the dulllest election within living memory, it has also been the most interesting. Meetings, as a rule, have been thinly attended, and very quiet. It has been unusual to hear hearty applause or lively interruptions. We have not had forced on our attention as formerly the display of colours and striking posters, the show of enthusiasm, the eager contest between well-defined parties struggling for victory and awakening a sporting interest

even in those who know and care little about political questions. We can hardly imagine such cheering bands of youths and girls as were seen in former elections dragging the candidate's carriage round the town or chairing him in the market place when the result of the poll was declared. The defeated parties and those who only look at the froth on the surface say that the electors were careless and indifferent or too disgusted to care about the results. It is a profound mistake based on ignorance of the masses of our fellow-countrymen and countrywomen and their thoughts and feelings. The party organisers and the political theorists do not understand the soul of the nation or how sound is its judgment when there is the chance of giving expression to it and the issues are fairly put forward.

The number of electors had been doubled. Practically the whole adult population, women as well as men, were for the first time entitled to vote. What has been the verdict of the "democracy" — what are the characteristics of those whom it has chosen to represent it? To watch and to hear its voice and to try to understand its meaning is a task full of interest.

The electors were not indifferent, but they were often perplexed. The choice before them was not a simple one between two fairly well-defined parties and the candidates put forward by each. The old names were no clear guide when evidently the strongest feeling in many Liberals was dislike of the Prime Minister, also a Liberal. The electors had, indeed, learned to have a profound distrust of political parties and their methods. They felt that new questions of deepest moment had arisen and a new spirit was needed. They were undoubtedly war-weary, though unshaken in their determination to secure a "just peace." Many were saddened by losses or oppressed by anxieties; others, released from strain by the cessation of war, were turning for relief to apparently careless gaiety. In many homes there was sickness, and an epidemic was raging. Yet in spite of all difficulties the nation did express a definite judgment on the general policy and the men who were to carry it out. Had all the Army been able to vote there is every reason to believe that judgment would have been still more emphatic. There was no mistake as to the general feeling among the soldiers' wives. Women gave usually an almost solid vote for those who had been in the services. The issues may have been confused, but the verdict of the nation was never so clearly pronounced either as to the policy of the country or the leader they wished to conduct its affairs, or in emphatic condemnation of those who opposed or neglected to support him in the conduct of the war. *Vox populi vox Dei* on this Day of Judgment. The so-called pacifists stood at the bar to hear the sentence of the British Democracy. "Philip Snowden, Ramsay MacDonald, Robert Outhwaite, and the rest of you who profess to represent the people, you have done nothing to help us in time of stress and of danger, you have tried to embarrass those to whom we had committed the task of carrying on the war, you have slandered your country and its defenders. Go! The men and the

women of the very districts where, if anywhere, you were supposed to have influence, reject you. You tried to hinder us in time of war; we distrust you in time of peace." The wider the suffrage and more democratic the Constitution, the more emphatic is the condemnation.

For the next group of the rejected it is impossible not to feel some sympathy. Why have so many Liberals, who as a rule did wish to help in the war, and most of whom did try to render real service to the nation, been rejected? Is it not mainly because the nation was not satisfied that they had put sufficient energy into the conduct of the war, and that when the election came these men seemed to be preoccupied mainly with the question of the destiny of the Liberal Party—a matter about which the country did not care? It had no love for "Coalition" as such. It only wanted to get certain things done and to support men who would do them. The desire was for a really national party. It hopes that the Coalition supporting the Government is such a party. It knows that the picture drawn of Unionists in the Coalition as a party anxious to stop any reforms desired by the Liberal wing is absurd, that the talk of "reaction" at the dictation of Tories is nonsense. If cleavage comes it will be on lines quite other than that, and the disruption of the huge majority will be due to other causes. Such disruption will inevitably come unless the members of the new Parliament have the opportunity of doing useful work. They will not sit by simply to register the proposals of the Government, or watch quietly while important questions are shelved. If the Government is to go on with this big majority, members must be set to work. They must have some power to *initiate* reforms. Panels or Committees might be formed of those who have special knowledge to advise on certain subjects, to report upon them, and to frame bills. A long list of useful law reforms, for example, might be given with which the law officers cannot possibly have time to deal. The Committees to consider such reforms should not consist solely of lawyers. Many laymen would understand most of such questions quite as well, though the lawyers might do the drafting. These questions need not divide the House on party lines. Labour members who, for various reasons, have declined the invitation to join the Government might give valuable assistance. The existence of the Government would not depend on the results of the votes in such Committees nor of the whole House in dealing with them except in rare cases. Time for discussion would have to be given, but if the length of speeches was limited, time would be available. The Whips should be taken off, as a rule, when these questions are considered. In other cases such panels or committees could report, and then the Government could frame its measures accordingly, supported by a body of men who were known to have considered the questions carefully on the merits. After such reports there would be less waste of time in obstructive divisions. Members would feel a real interest in getting things done, instead of hanging about

waiting for a division bell, knowing that the last thing their nominal leaders want is that their followers, so long as they vote straight, should know or care anything about the subject supposed to be under the consideration of the House. Unless they are treated as intelligent human beings the majority will go to pieces, and unless the subjects demanding attention are duly dealt with the country will try to find some other method of carrying out what it desires than regular Parliamentary procedure.

Lastly, though the subject of economy seems rarely to have been mentioned at the elections, the new Parliament will, if disaster is to be avoided, be obliged to discharge the trust which devolves upon it of checking all unnecessary expenditure. Its duty will be to put an end to the system of trying to secure the support of various special interests by making lavish grants or giving special pecuniary advantages to secure their support at the expense of the community as a whole. The truest friends of a Government may sometimes be its severest critics.

ALFRED HOPKINSON.

THE GENERAL ELECTION AND THE FUTURE OF THE LIBERAL PARTY.

THE General Election has split the Liberal Party into two parts, whose representatives in the House of Commons each find themselves in an unfortunate position. The larger fragment in the House (it is difficult to estimate their relative importance in the country) is in close alliance with its old opponents, the Conservatives, and members owe their seats in great measure to the goodwill of the Conservative Whips, while the smaller fragment's representatives are so few that they hardly count in a division. In these circumstances the question, What is the future of the Liberal Party? naturally arises. Many people already profess to doubt whether it has any. To me it seems certain that it has a great future; and in this article I shall try to give reasons for my faith and to forecast that future.

I begin with the belief that nothing is more important to the future government and well-being of our country than the question, what will become of the Liberal Party? It has been the great instrument of the long series of changes which have transformed England in the last hundred years. Can we doubt, then, that our future will be very different, according as the Liberal Party plays a great or a little part, or no part at all?

Liberalism, as I conceive it, is not merely political. It is the doctrine that life in all its departments is best ordered on principles of liberty and of reason, and not merely of authority, vested rights, and established usages—certainly not on a basis of class feeling. Authority tested by reason and freely accepted, has, beyond all doubt, its place in a man's life and in the government of a country: so have established usages and vested rights; but human freedom and reason and equal justice for all not only have their place, they have the supreme place. Without them authority and vested interests become tyranny and established usage becomes unreasoning prejudice. The class war is abhorrent to their very essence.

Liberalism in politics is the application of these great principles to the government of States: the Liberal Party is the organisation of men and women to secure that these principles shall be supreme in the government of their country. It is the instrument which in this country has always fought for civil, religious, and political liberty, and which of late years has more and more realised that there is another kind of liberty also to be fought for: that to the man born in a slum and trained in the gutter, condemned to spend his life in ill-paid and monotonous toil relieved only by periods of unemployment or the joys of the public-house, civil, religious, and political liberty are little better than a mockery. They may declare him equal to every other citizen before the law, free to think and worship or not to worship as he likes, free to vote as he likes and equal in power to any other voter; but in spite of all that, his surroundings rob him of real liberty. He needs another kind of liberty also, an economic liberty, which will give him a fair opportunity to develop what is best in him, and to live a life worthy of a rational and civilised being.

The Party which stands for these principles seems to me to have in its custody most of what is best, politically speaking, in the life and aspirations of our people. To-day it has met with a great disaster, a great rebuff at the hands of the enfranchised people (for whose enfranchisement it has been the chief worker), and everyone is asking what is to be its future: can it recover; is its work done? I do not believe its work is done: the nation has great need of it still: every nation has great need of a Party which puts liberty first, and rates all other good things mainly as means to real liberty. It represents a principle whose place is permanent in the organisation of our life. That is why I am sure that the Liberal Party has a great future.

It is easy to exaggerate the rebuff if we only regard the number of Liberals returned to Parliament. The true test is the votes cast, and measured by this Liberalism is at once seen to be still a great force in our politics. Of 10,760,000 votes cast Liberal candidates received 2,759,000, or just over 25 per cent. of the whole. So far as the Coalition Liberals are concerned, no doubt some of the votes given to them were Unionist; but the Independent Liberals alone received more than 1,300,000 votes, and if they had gained seats in proportion, as they should have done under a just system of representation, they would have numbered 69, not 28, in the House. The cynic may say that these calculations of the popular vote, and of what the just representation should have been, are of little moment when the House of Commons divides. Even then they are not without weight, and in forecasting the future they are all important. Still, there is no doubt that there has been a rebuff and a disaster.

Parties have met the like fate before, and have recovered. In 1895 the Liberals had only 177 seats. In 1906 they got more than 400. In 1906 the Unionists had only 157: to-day they have considerably more than half the House. Why should not the Liberal Party recover again in the same way? The recent General Election was fought under the glamour of a great war and a great victory. The Prime Minister and his colleagues made the utmost use of that glamour: the Conservative Whips employed it to secure a great preponderance for their Party; and more than one hundred Liberal candidates threw in their lot with them, and were thereby carried to victory at the polls. The remaining Liberals were almost all submerged, but not because they were Liberals; not because the people had ceased to believe in liberty as the great basis of government. It was because the people imagined that by supporting the candidate blessed by the Government, whether Conservative, Liberal, Labour, or what not, they were voting for the cause of their country and in some way or other against the cruel and faithless foe. It was the khaki election of 1902 over again on a grander scale and with vaster issues.

If that were all, there need be no doubt that a revulsion like that of 1906 would follow in due course. But there is much more than that. There is the split in the Liberal Party, and there is the growth of a third Party. The split is not the first that the Party has suffered, but it is the greatest, and in some ways different in

kind. The Liberal Party for two generations has been constantly losing those of its members who could no longer keep up in the march of political progress. Notably in 1886 there was the secession of the Liberal Unionists. In this case, however, there is no definite measure which some have failed to accept, nor have a minority left the Party. It is the majority who have closely allied themselves with the Conservative Party—and that not for war work, but for peace-time work—with the result of creating a great Conservative majority capable of easily out-voting all other Parties in the House combined.

Such a split is an important factor, but the growth of a third Party is a far greater; and it is a new factor. In 1906, when the last great Liberal recovery took place, the Labour Party had hardly come into existence: now it is evidently established as a permanent and important force. This is surely the determining factor in the whole future of our politics, and therefore in the future of the Liberal Party. Hitherto we have had two great British Parties, with minor groups of some importance, and of course the Irish Nationalist Party standing apart. In future it would seem that we shall have three main British Parties. It is true that in this Parliament there are only 63 Labour members, but the Labour candidates received 2,392,000 votes, or just over 22 per cent. of those cast, a vast increase on any previous poll of the Party. The growth of the Labour poll, the control which the political element has acquired over the machinery of Trade Unionism and the pressure thereby exercised upon Trade Unionists—especially upon Trade Union officials of all kinds—to support the Labour Party, make it very unlikely that it will play a smaller part in future elections. Of course the claim sometimes put forward that it represents the whole working class is absurd: a great part of the working classes are Liberals in principle and opposed to any mere class cleavage in politics: others are Conservative. There is no reason for doubting that this will remain so.

In view of these facts, what are we to say of the future of the Liberal Party? I do not mean the immediate future, limited by the life of this Parliament. Clearly for the immediate future the proportions and organisation of the Liberal Party are pretty well fixed; and its work is to give the Government a fair chance to carry out its programme of Reconstruction, criticising where any deviation from sound principle appears, but knowing how to make such criticism helpful, not destructive. I would speak rather of the future of the Liberal Party over a decade or even a generation. During that time will each of the three British parties maintain its separate existence, or shall we revert to a two-party system, part of the Liberals going to the Conservatives and part to Labour? That is indeed the development expected by many: many of the labour organisers have long worked for it, and one constantly meets men and women not of the working classes who desire it now because they have begun to despair of obtaining great reforms through the Liberal Party. The circumstances of the Party to-day give it an air of probability, and suggest that if the Coalition holds together the majority will absorb their Liberal allies, while the

Independent Liberals will gravitate to the Labour opposition and form a united Party with them.

It cannot be denied that under our present electoral system there is some danger of this. Three or more candidates struggling for a single seat make an almost certain present of it to the Conservatives. The tendency, therefore, must be for the other Parties to avoid, as far as possible, such contests by selecting in each constituency one candidate to fight the Conservative. Some people would no doubt welcome this reversion to a two-party system, as best suited to our British institutions. I should think it a calamity because it would mean driving off many good Liberals into the Conservative fold. Worse, it would split the electors into a Labour Party and an anti-Labour Party, which would mean the class war. Happily no such result seems possible in England, where the real division of opinion to-day is threefold. Conservatives on the whole approve of things as they are, with minor amendments: Socialists think the present state of society radically bad and destined to be replaced by one based on a totally different principle; and Liberals desire no revolutionary change, but recognise great and far-reaching evils only to be cured by a bold application of reforms directed towards liberty and equality of opportunity. This being the division of opinion, why should not a division of parties corresponding to it remain? Any attempt to run our politics on a Labour versus anti-Labour basis would mean that thousands of Liberals would refuse to vote for a Socialist candidate, and thousands of Socialists refuse to vote for a Liberal.

If, then, the Liberal Party is to remain, will its two fragments reunite, or will one of them only play a part in its future? That depends upon whether the Coalition Liberals are absorbed by the Conservative Party. I do not myself fear that: some few may succumb, but the great mass of them have far too good a grasp of principles and are far too much in earnest about those principles. I look forward rather to their differing with their present allies. The programme of Mr. Lloyd George seems to make too great demands upon the Tories of the older school: most of it is Liberal in essence: it will, moreover, cost great sums. No doubt until peace is made, and for a while after, the Coalition will pull together, but then a split seems inevitable. What if Mr. Lloyd George and his Coalition Liberals, and the large number of younger Tories with leanings towards social reform, should form a Party of their own? They would need, and might well get, the support of the Independent Liberals, a support important not so much in the House of Commons, where they are few, as in the country, where they are a large element in the electorate. If that should happen we should once more have a large and powerful Centre Party—in effect, a Liberal Party, by whatever name called—standing between Conservatism on the one hand and the class war on the other.

But in considering the future of our political parties it is impossible to blind oneself to the fact that very much depends upon the system of representation we may have. I do not mean upon the franchise. Evidently much depends on that also, for with a

narrow franchise we could never have had a powerful Socialist, or Labour, Party. But perhaps even more depends upon electoral systems. The old joke of the American politician who said he "would give the people the widest possible franchise provided he was himself allowed to count the votes" is only a grotesque statement of a great truth, usually overlooked. With single-member areas and no alternative vote—our British system to-day—you get one result. With the same areas, the same franchise, and the same division of Parties, but with the Alternative Vote, you would get quite a different result. With larger areas each returning several members, and with the "block vote"—*i.e.*, each elector having the right of voting for as many candidates as there are seats to fill—you would get a third and totally different result, minorities being almost wiped out. With Proportional Representation you would get still another result, minorities and majorities obtaining representation in just proportion to their strength.

If our present system still prevails it is easy to see that the tendency will be to squeeze out the middle Party. It will be attacked by the Conservatives as half revolutionary, and at the same time blamed by the Labour Party for the delay of reforms. It cannot outbid the Tory in patriotic anti-foreigner fervour, nor the Socialist in promises of material prosperity. Many of the more moderate Liberals will be frightened into Conservatism: many of the more advanced driven by despair into revolutionary ideas. While the Liberals had a chance to carry out great reforms, their deeds were their answer and their strength; but the misfortune of 1886 and the outbreak of the Great War stopped their career of reforms, and, most unjustly, undermined their credit with the younger and less thinking voters. But what if our present system be reformed? The ninety-seven results in this election, where the successful candidate only got a minority of the votes cast, will surely make us think. Both the supporters of the Alternative Vote and of P.R. will use it as an argument. I am not concerned here with the merits of those proposals. I only desire to consider how they would affect the future of the Liberal Party.

Many consider that with the Alternative Vote the Middle Party, *i.e.*, the Liberal, would benefit very greatly. They argue that where the Conservatives were bottom they would give their second choice to the Liberals, and where the Labour men were bottom they would do the same. This, however, is not in accordance with experience: in Belgium, when the system of second ballots prevailed, the Conservatives gave their second choices to Labour, and Labour gave theirs to Conservatives, to keep the Liberals out. If that were to be so with us, evidently the Liberal Party would tend more than ever to be squeezed out, especially as Alternative Voting would greatly encourage three, four, and five-cornered fights.

I conclude, therefore, that whether under the present system or under the Alternative Vote, the future strength of the Liberal Party will be precarious. Not so if P.R. should be adopted. Under that system every important body of opinion will be sure of its

fair share of representation. In Belgium, under the Second Ballot system, Liberal representatives almost disappeared, but Liberalism remained in the country, and as soon as P.R. was adopted it showed itself everywhere and obtained many seats.

Thus we may look for the continuance of the Liberal Party under all circumstances as one of the great Parties of the State. But under our unreformed electoral system, or under the Alternative Vote, its strength from election to election will be precarious: constantly, like each of the other Parties, subject to disastrous routs: perhaps more likely to be under-represented than either of its rivals. Under a really representative system it would be secure, changing the number of its representatives a little from time to time, but always remaining a great power in Parliament, because always commanding many convinced adherents in the country. Sometimes it might be the largest Party and itself form a Government: at other times its support would be necessary to whichever of the other Parties was charged with the Government.

So far I have spoken of the power and political position of the Liberal Party in the future. That, however, is the least part of the matter. What of its work? Civil liberty—equality before the law and freedom from the arbitrary power of the Executive—is nearly perfect in this land—or, at least, was; and will be again, when peace has enabled us to remove the restrictions we freely imposed upon ourselves to win the war. Religious liberty awaits little but justice in the single school areas, and a peaceful settlement some day of all the relations of Church and State. Political liberty has been carried a long step forward by the recent Reform Act, and everyone looks for the completion of universal suffrage in no great time. There will still remain the task of democratising our Second Chamber, and the far greater task of solving the Irish question by means of Home Rule; and when we have done that Political Liberty will be nearly complete in these islands.

But economic liberty will long afford a wide field for the work of the Liberal Party—for reforms by which it must give a real freedom, and a real equality of opportunity, to every boy and girl. It is not merely a question of giving the people more comfort and more to spend: that might be done by a system which would enslave them. It is a question of extending true freedom by redeeming our people from the bondage which want, and evil surroundings, and ignorance impose upon them. It is only the Liberal Party that can direct this work of social reform into its true channels, the Liberal Party with its great traditions of liberty and of equality between class and class, with its leaders who, having nothing to gain themselves by great changes, put at the service of their country and of their less fortunate brethren their education, their time, and their work. Without sacrificing the liberties already achieved, without abolishing private initiative and personal thrift, without subjecting us to a bureaucratic tyranny which would bind our daily lives and deaden our energies, it will know how to assure to all our people a real chance of developing that which is best in them, for their own good and for their country's.

ANEURIN WILLIAMS.

JUSTICE AND CONCILIATION IN THE BALKANS.

BEFORE the dawn of history, and for a long time after, the dealings between nations, tribes, families, and individuals were normally regulated in accordance with "the good old plan, that they should take who have the power and they should keep who can." The conqueror did as he pleased with the conquered, who was either killed or became a slave. At a later date the principle of ransom was introduced, and the vanquished was sometimes allowed to bargain with the victor for his life and even for his liberty and a portion of his substance. Later still, when men had learned to read and write, it became the practice to write down the bargain; as civilisation advanced all things were done decently and in order, and robbery with violence was camouflaged by means of treaties. Human society has scarcely yet passed beyond this stage, and modern treaties concluded after wars as a rule recognise and register, like their predecessors, the *jus fortioris*. The action of Brennus when he threw his sword into the scale at Rome differed little from that of the German general who pronounced his *sic volo sic jubeo* at Brest-Litovsk to friends and foes alike; or from that of the Rumanian Foreign Minister at Bucarest in 1913, when he said to the Bulgarian negotiators, "Sign, or we occupy your capital in forty-eight hours." But the conscience of mankind, outraged and revolted by the horrors of recent years, now seeks, as President Wilson said at Carlisle, to "turn away from the savagery of interests to the dignity of the performance of the right."

Almost all European territorial settlements have been drawn up on the conclusion of wars, and are embodied in treaties proclaiming the will of the victors. Justice and the rights of nations have been left out of consideration. At the Congress of Vienna the "bosses" portioned out the kingdoms of the world precisely as though they were family estates cultivated by tenants *adscripti glebæ*. At the Congress of Berlin Beaconsfield and Bismarck humiliated Russia and sought to prop up the moribund Ottoman Empire by brushing away the Treaty of San Stefano—the first which recognised in some degree the principle of nationality and, as such, the harbinger of the new epoch; they divided the Bulgarian nation into three parts and handed back some two million Christians, mainly Bulgarians and Armenians, to the tender mercies of Turkish rule. At Bucarest in 1913 three ambitious little States, having conquered a fourth, divided its patrimony and perpetuated the injustice of Berlin. On this occasion the principle *Victoribus spolia* was frankly proclaimed; the booty was divided within the space of eight days from the cessation of hostilities and the submission of the victim was extorted by menaces.

This last arrangement, the third Treaty of Bucarest, still holds the field. It has never, indeed, been recognised by any European Government and has therefore no juridical existence; its only title to consideration is to be found in the *fiat* of the ex-Kaiser. It may be classed with its successors, the fourth Treaty of Bucarest and the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, which were also approved by that monarch

and which must also disappear. A compact which rends asunder one of the Balkan races and hands over a third part of it to alien domination is a crime against humanity, and cannot stand. The treaty has been denounced by Mr. Asquith as the source of continued discord in the Balkans; in the words of the Carnegie Report, it registers the "illegitimate pretensions of victorious nationalities." When its prototype, the Treaty of Berlin, was signed men knew less of nationalities and felt less for them than they do to-day; Lord Beaconsfield, on his return to London, told the cheering crowd that he had brought it "peace with honour," and few among those who acclaimed him had any conception of the hideous future which that "peace" betokened for thousands of their fellow creatures. To-day the world knows better, and if there are any who imagine that alien Christian rule is more merciful than Turkish they will be disillusioned by a glance at the Carnegie Report. While the Turk contents himself with murder, robbery and extortion the alien Christian ruler adds to these crimes an inquisitorial severity; he forbids his victim to speak his own language, to worship in his own Church, and to call himself by the name of his nation.

The arrangement of Bucarest cannot be allowed to stand, not only because it is unjust, but because it will inevitably lead to fresh conflicts in the Balkans and possibly to another European war. "We want a lasting peace," says Lord Phillimore,* "but we want a just peace. We want it because no peace but a just peace can be counted upon as lasting, but also for higher reasons. In what sense do we speak of a just peace? Is it retributive justice or distributive justice, the *suum cuique* of the Roman jurists?" Retribution there should be, he says, in order to prevent powerful States from wantonly engaging in war, but it should not take the form of deprivation of territory without regard to the wishes of the population of that territory. "The justice which should be the principal object in the (future) treaty is distributive justice, justice to nations, peoples, and races." In this sense we must reply to those who tell us that Bulgaria by her treachery and ruthlessness has "forfeited" all claim to Macedonia. It is not a question of punishing Bulgaria, even if she is guilty of all the enormities of which her foes (of whose misdeeds we never hear) accuse her; with regard to the "balance of criminality" some strange surprises may be in store for us when another Carnegie Report appears. It is a question of punishing the Macedonian Bulgars by severing them permanently from their kith and kin and subjecting them to the merciless processes of compulsory assimilation applied by their bitterest enemies.

"No right anywhere exists," said President Wilson in his message to the Senate in January, 1917, "to hand people about from sovereignty to sovereignty as if they were property." That is what has been done by the Treaty of Bucarest. The greater part of Macedonia has been handed over to the Serbians, who, even thirty years ago, never made any ethnic claim to its possession. At the time, and for many years later, nothing was heard of a Serbian movement. The Serbians never discovered that they

* *Three Centuries of Treaties of Peace*, pp. 2, 3.

had any interest in Macedonia till 1885, the year of King Milan's unsuccessful attack on Bulgaria; the new propaganda was encouraged by Austria in order to divert popular attention from Bosnia and Herzegovina, and was welcomed by Turkey as a counterblast to the more dangerous Bulgarian movement. During the writer's visits to Macedonia in the 'nineties little was heard of it beyond amusing stories of the good pairs of boots, suits of clothes and even dinners which the poorer class of Bulgarian peasants obtained by sending their children to the Serbian schools; the children learned to read and write Serbian, and after leaving school found the knowledge they had acquired was more or less useful for reading and writing Bulgarian.

Meanwhile, what has happened in the country itself during these thirty years? In 1878, as soon as the Bulgarian population in the Vardar and Struma Valleys heard of the decision of the Powers at Berlin, it revolted, but was induced to lay down arms by a European Commission. For a time, under the statesmanlike guidance of Stamboloff and the Exarch Joseph, it remained quiet, awaiting the realisation of the promised reforms. But the Turkish yoke grew more and more intolerable, and the younger generation lost patience. In 1895 came a partial outbreak in the Melnik district, and in 1902 revolts in the districts of Monastir and Razlog. Lastly, in 1903, came the great insurrection in Western Macedonia, repressed, like its predecessors, with the utmost barbarity by the Turks, who were in many cases aided by a number of Greek bands. More than one hundred Bulgarian villages were burnt, and some 80,000 peasants were homeless in the mountains at the approach of winter. The Powers intervened with ineffective reforms; the Young Turks then tried their hand, and their blind and indiscriminate severity brought about a Balkan combination and the extinction of the Ottoman Empire in Europe.

In the sad history of this period one fact stands out: all the efforts to shake off the Turkish yoke were made by the Bulgarians, all the sacrifices were theirs. As Lord Bryce observes, there is no poetic justice in history, yet it seems hard to believe that for those who made those sacrifices there is no better fate in store than subjection to their deadly foes, no hope of national unity. Some 18,000 young Macedonians fought by the side of their kinsmen at Lule Burgas; when the survivors sought to return to their homes they had to choose between renunciation of their nationality or perpetual exile. It would have been better for them had Lule Burgas been lost, for the victorious Turkish army would have occupied Macedonia, and whatever horrors might have ensued the prospect of eventual liberty would not have been destroyed. Most of them might have perished, but "better an end with horrors," says the Bulgarian proverb, "than horrors without end."

If vicarious punishment must be meted out to the Macedonian Bulgars we should at least form a clear idea with regard to the alleged crime of their kinsmen. We are told that Bulgaria proved faithless to the ideal of Pan Slavism. Pan Slavism, Pangermanism, Panhellenism, Panserbism, and the other Pans would be excellent things in their way if they did not serve to cloak Imperialistic tendencies. These tendencies sometimes come unexpectedly to

light, as when a Greek King is publicly hailed "Constantine XII. Bulgaroktónos,"* or when a Serbian Regent addresses Macedonian Bulgars as "Sons of the Emperor Dushan." The principle of nationalities supplies us with a better and sounder ideal. Since the first days of her freedom Bulgaria has been combating Russian Imperialism; Stamboloff, the coryphæus of the struggle, was for years a hero in the eyes of the British public. In 1913 the "treachery" unquestionably began when Imperialist Russia, affected by subterranean German influences, connived at the invasion of Bulgaria by Rumania, a non-Slav State then in alliance with Germany. No experienced observer ever expects gratitude in politics, but on this occasion the "Liberating Power" certainly forfeited whatever claim she still retained to the loyalty of her former *protégé*. Bulgaria was crushed; at Bucarest Russia did practically nothing to help her; those to whom she had rendered great and valuable services had no mercy on her; she was despoiled, ruined, disgraced, humiliated.† Her rightful heritage in Macedonia was taken from her. "Bulgaria undoubtedly had a justifiable grievance," writes Sir Thomas Holdich,‡ referring to her defection to the Central Powers, "no other course could possibly have been expected of her." Notwithstanding the conduct of Russia, the people in general were unwilling to fight against her or against the Western Powers, for whom they had nothing but friendship; the troops, when mobilised, came sullenly to the standards, and some serious mutinies took place; but for the hope of winning back Macedonia they would not have fought.

The time has not come for disclosures, but it may be mentioned that as late as April, 1915, Bulgaria made a definite proposition offering to place all her forces at the disposal of the *Entente*. The supposed long-standing conspiracy with Germany never existed; it was not until the last week in August, when the War Minister, General Fitcheff, a warm friend of the Western Powers, was dismissed that a decision was taken. That decision, according to Mr. Asquith, was due to "fear and greed." Fear undoubtedly existed at the Palace, where Duke Johann of Mecklenburg-Strelitz conveyed to King Ferdinand the same threat of the Kaiser which was conveyed to King Constantine by Queen Sophie—"Woe to him who resists my destructive sword"—there was no prospect of help from any quarter, for the Western Powers delayed the despatch of their troops to Salonika till too late. "Greed" may, or may not, be a correct description of the natural desire to retrieve the losses imposed by the Treaty of Bucarest.

No excuse, of course, can be offered for the insensate act of General Savoff in attacking the Serbian and Greek armies on the 29th June, 1913. It showed how a good general can be a childish politician; it was exactly what the Serbs and Greeks wanted, for it legitimised the offensive which they were about to take; it afforded Rumania the desired opportunity for posing as the "gendarme of Europe;" in the Balkans gendarmes are not always disinterested

* *The Bulgarian-Slayer*. The title was first taken by the Emperor Basil the Second, who conquered Macedonia and put out the eyes of 15,000 Bulgarians.

† Gueshoff, *The Balkan League*, p. 106.

‡ *Boundaries in Europe and the Near East*, p. 84.

guardians of the law. The extent to which the act has been exploited by the war literature of the period gives the measure of its folly. It is evident from his circular that the general aimed at giving a "jog" to tardy diplomacy by occupying some important positions, but he failed to see that, politically, he was delivering his country into the hands of her many enemies. He was recalled and dismissed, and the troops were withdrawn—but in vain; the moral position of Bulgaria had already been ruined while the advantage of the military initiative was sacrificed. M. Venizelos, always large-minded, was ready to accept an apology, but the Serbian militarists would not let go their bone, and the fratricidal struggle, the most deplorable and scandalous of modern wars, followed.

Militarism has always been the bane of the Balkans. The prank of General Savoff does not stand alone. The humiliation of Greece in 1897 was brought about by militarism aided by noisy journalism. The Military League at Athens was saved from itself by M. Venizelos. The Serbian *militaires*, by insisting upon war, destroyed the last hope of maintaining Balkan unity by Russian arbitration; two years later they brought about the ruin of their country by thwarting the efforts of the Western Powers to bring Bulgaria into the fold of the *Entente*. For had those efforts succeeded—the proposals of Bulgaria were not unreasonable—the second invasion of Serbia would never have taken place; Rumania would have come into line on the same day as Bulgaria, Greece could not have stood out, and the Central Powers would have been confronted with a million men on their South-Eastern front; Turkey would have been isolated, the disasters of Gallipoli and Kut would have been averted, and the war might have been shortened by at least a year. Likewise the Rumanian military officers, by insisting on the invasion of Bulgaria in 1913—despite the prudent opposition of King Carol—prepared the way for the catastrophe which befel their country three years later, for it was the Bulgarian advance across the Danube which brought about the collapse of the national defence and necessitated the evacuation of Wallachia. The upstart of militarism must be rooted out in the Balkans. The one necessary and legitimate task which awaited the Balkan armies—the overthrow of Turkish rule in the Peninsula—has been accomplished; there is no further need for their existence and they should disappear.

They will not disappear, however, nor can they be expected to disappear, until each of the Balkan States enters upon its rightful inheritance. So long as any one of these States feels and knows that it has been sundered from a considerable portion of its kindred, it will prepare for the day when it can vindicate its right by force, and its military programme will set the pace for its neighbours. The old competition in armaments will go on as before. The old methods of assimilation by force will again be practised on the subject populations; there will be sporadic revolts and bands will appear in the mountains. The more ruthless and cruel the methods of denationalisation, the more energetic will be the protest from beyond the frontier, for the kinsmen of the oppressed will realise that no time is to be lost in effecting their salvation.

The just claims of Rumania to Transylvania, Bessarabia, and the

greater part of the Banat; of Serbia to the Serbo-Croat and Slovene regions of the north-west; of Greece to the Ægean Islands and the Hellenic districts of Asia Minor seem to meet with general acquiescence. The right of Albania to the frontier accorded to her by Europe is clear. The right of Bulgaria to Macedonia is undeniable—unless we are prepared to set aside the principle of nationalities, to which we adhere in regard to the other claims. But the Treaty of Bucarest stands in the way. That compact, which King Carol, one of the principal beneficiaries under its provisions, described as a truce, not a treaty, cannot be maintained without the risk of future bloodshed. It divides Macedonia between Greece and Serbia, assigning the greater part of the country to the latter. Since the date of its signature, and especially since the outbreak of the great war, a goodly army of professors and professional writers has been mustered to justify this act of rapacity. “D’abord je prends,” said the great Frederick, “ensuite je trouve des pédants pour justifier mon bon droit.” Of the making of books, pamphlets, and maps there has been no end. It is impossible to deal seriously with the war-time literature on the subject; many of the writers, secure against criticism, have, as Thucydides says, “fought their way to the region of the fabulous.”

Those who desire to form a sound opinion on Macedonian ethnography may turn from the controversialists to the impartial and conscientious writers who visited the country in Turkish times, in many cases before the era of controversy, to the scholars who have made a scientific study of the populations, languages and dialects, and to those who, officially or unofficially, have been brought into contact with the peasantry as well as with the inhabitants of the towns. It is noteworthy that these highly qualified observers have failed to recognise the existence of the “Macedonians,” the nondescript or “floating” population without nationality, which the Serbian professors have latterly discovered. The designation, as the Carnegie Report remarks, is simply “a euphemism designed to conceal the existence of Bulgarians in Macedonia,” and serves to justify the partition of their country between Serbs and Greeks. It is amusing to watch the advance of the euphemistic tendency; the river known time out of mind as the “Bulgarian” Morava is now the “Eastern” Morava, the “Bulgarophone Greeks” (*i.e.*, Bulgarians who acknowledge the Patriarchate) are now “Slavophones,” and so on. The newly discovered “Macedonian” race is provided with frontiers and dignified with a special colouring in the propagandist maps now published in London.

Thus it is sought to deny the very existence of the Macedonian Bulgars to the outer world, while at home every landmark of their history is removed, every name which betrays their presence in the country is altered. Some writers, who are evidently only acquainted with the towns, dwell upon the mixed character of the population and imaginè they have found a serious indication of this in the designation *macédoine* which some French cook has given to an assortment of fruits! There are no French cooks in rural Macedonia. In the towns a great mixture of races undoubtedly exists; and even French cooks interested in ethnography may be

found; in the country there are Turkish, Albanian, and Vlach villages in certain localities, and Greek villages in the extreme south, but the great mass of the population is Bulgarian.

To those who know the country it may seem superfluous to insist on this fact, which was generally admitted in years past, but since the war the public has undoubtedly been much misled on this point by a voluminous and unrebuked partisan literature. Efforts are even made to deny that the language of the people is Bulgarian; with regard to this, it is enough to quote Weigand, a very high authority: "All linguistic specialists," he says, "are unanimous that it is Bulgarian, and the politicians cannot alter the fact." The language in the north-west naturally approximates in some respects to Serbian, but even here it possesses all the distinctive features of Bulgarian. Language is not a necessary test of nationality; the Albanians in Attica, for instance, may be regarded as politically Greeks though the language of the home betrays their Albanian origin. The best test of a man's nationality is what he believes himself to be. In Turkish times the Macedonian Slav peasant when asked as to his nationality invariably replied, "I am a Bulgarian." To-day he would be afraid to make such an avowal, but his national consciousness remains the same.

Another indication almost equally convincing is to be found in the reluctance of the Bulgarians to consent to any division of Macedonia. The Serbians and Greeks have always demanded partition, the Bulgarians have consistently opposed it, declaring that rather than hand over a portion of their kindred to alien rule they would welcome the creation of a Macedonian autonomous State and renounce all claim to annexation. The difference of aims more than once prevented an arrangement in the past. In 1897 Greece could have had the aid of Bulgaria against Turkey had she been willing to consent to Macedonian autonomy. In 1912 Bulgaria only agreed to a delimitation with Serbia in case autonomy should prove impossible; could she induce the Congress to maintain the integrity of Macedonia and to grant it autonomy, she would now resign all her claims, like the real mother who besought King Solomon to spare her child.

In regard to the geographical distribution of the Bulgarian element in Macedonia the following official documents possess unquestionable importance:—

(1) The firman of February 29th, 1870, establishing the Exarchate, in accordance with which the *exsequatur* was granted to seven Bulgarian metropolitans, whose dioceses covered the greater part of Macedonia. These bishops have all been expelled by the Serbs.

(2) The establishment of the two autonomous "Bulgarian" vilayets by the Constantinople Conference in 1876. The southern vilayet, with its capital at Sofia, embraced the greater part of Macedonia.

(3) The Treaty of San Stefano, which included all Macedonia in the "Big Bulgaria."

(4) The Reform area laid down by the Mürzsteg programme in 1904 (after the Bulgarian revolt of the previous year). This

excluded "Old Serbia" and the Greek districts in the extreme South.

The opportunity which now presents itself for a settlement of the Balkan question in accordance with the principle of nationalities is unique.* The three great Empires which held portions of the Balkan races in bondage and whose ambitions were a constant menace to their independence are in liquidation. It will now be possible for Rumania, Serbia, and Greece to attain the full measure of their legitimate expansion. Rumania will probably become a State numbering 15,000,000 inhabitants, Serbia will number 12-13,000,000, Greece about 8,000,000, Bulgaria, if justice is done, will count about 5,000,000 or at most 5,500,000. Had such an arrangement been possible in 1913 the lamentable war of that year would hardly have taken place, for the three first-named States would have been satisfied with the much greater and legitimate gains within their grasp and would hardly have grudged Bulgaria the smaller portion which is her due. Is it not possible that to-day, influenced by the hope of a lasting pacification if not by a higher motive, they may "turn away from the savagery of interests to the dignity of the performance of the right"? Once the legitimate aspirations of each of these States have been realised, the true aim of statesmanship will be to attain a permanent peace and to reconstitute the Balkan Alliance, no longer with a military programme, but with a view to joint progress and mutual aid. So long as Macedonia remains a Bulgarian Alsace-Lorraine there will be an open sore in the bosom of the Peninsula and no real peace.

"But the three States will be strong," say some short-sighted partisans, "Bulgaria will be weak; it does not matter what she does." Who knows? France waited nearly half a century to recover Alsace-Lorraine. The *jus fortioris* will soon be an anachronism. The best Balkan settlement will be one of voluntary conciliation. The Treaty of Bucarest and certain secret compacts, which must not be discussed, are now the principal obstacles to a just and permanent arrangement. It is to be hoped that these treaties, instead of being overruled by a higher authority, will be voluntarily abandoned by their signatories; if possible, no treaty, no matter how unjust, should be treated as a scrap of paper. Yugoslavia, which should receive all its natural maritime outlets, will be strong enough to cede Macedonia; she will be stronger, indeed, without it. Greece with Smyrna and abundant elbow-room in Asia Minor should give Kavala, which is of secondary importance to her, to Bulgaria, to whom its possession is vital. Rumania may well restore the southern portion of the Dobrudja to Bulgaria; she was forced to accept that province instead of kindred Bessarabia, but she has now come into her own. Albania must not be ill-treated because she is small; Montenegro has a right to choose her own government and to obtain a sufficiency of seaports. If voluntary concessions in the Balkans are impossible, impartial and disinterested America may be called to arbitrate—under the guidance of a high-minded statesman she will see to "the performance of the right."

JAMES D. BOURCHIER.

* The question of frontiers is discussed in detail in *The Final Settlement in the Balkans*, reprinted from the *Quarterly Review*. (Clowes, London. Dutton, New York.)

THE UNITY OF THE GREEK RACE.*

"**Q**UISQUE suos patimur manes." Each of us has to suffer the ghost of his past. Of no race is this truer than the Greek. Greece is haunted by the past. She is perpetually being judged by the standard of fifth century Athens and Sparta, at their best, as idealised both by their own literature and by the long traditions of Humanism. It is a tribute, when we come to think of it, to the essential soundness of classical education, that it has thus idealised its subject matter. The average English schoolboy, however deficient his grip of the language, has received one ineradicable impression, that the ancient Greeks were amazingly fine fellows. The danger to modern Greece of comparisons based on such idealism of the past is that from the nature of the case they have generally been made by young men without experience of life. Before the present war, the men who knew Greece best, and who ought to have been her champions and interpreters, were chiefly young Oxford and Cambridge men, who passed direct from undergraduate life at home to undergraduate life abroad, without knowledge that even in England political and municipal life have their depressing side. The Greek peasant they got to know, and his simplicity, kindness, and essential nobility of character impressed them as they met him, in the simple relations of master and servant, employer and employed. With the educated classes they came little into contact, except where, as travellers or archæologists, they had to deal with the small landlord or the local lawyer or tradesman. They never asked themselves whether the shortcomings they sometimes found in these local notables would not have been equally present under similar conditions in Norfolk or Yorkshire or Wales. They could see some kinship to the past in the Fustanella, but none in the Black Coat. They failed to draw the inference that if the common people were so essentially sound in character, it was unlikely that wealth and education should have made such a profound difference in the professional classes who sprang from them. A *reductio ad absurdum* of such an attitude came under my own notice only the other day. Venizelos himself was described by an ex-undergraduate, passionately devoted to the Greek peasant, as "After all, only a black-coat politician, though the best of them"!

It is not necessary at this moment to stress this side of the burden of the past. Nearly all the classical scholars, middle-aged or young, who had in their time spent months or years in Greece, have utilised their knowledge in war service on the spot, and the Intelligence Service of the Levant bristles with archæologists and students of dialect. Are not the doings of "the Black Beard of the Ægean" written in "The Times"? Are not the forays in which he led the islanders of Calymnos, driving off Turkish cattle from the mainland to feed the British Fleet, already part of a New Homeric Saga? Changed conditions have brought even those scholars who have not naturally Professor Myres's breadth of view into touch with the public life of Greece. It is satisfactory to notice

* Annual Address to the Historical Association, January 10th.

that they have become Philhellenes in a much fuller sense than they ever were before. Similarly the sympathy felt by our Salonica forces with Greece has immensely increased since they have been fighting side by side with Venizelist officers, and have something to compare with the past besides the peasants and shopkeepers of Salonica. The high standard we set in our hearts for Modern Greece, irritating and unfair as it must often seem to the Greeks themselves, is after all the promise of an intimate comradeship if we can once feel persuaded that our hopes are not misplaced.

A ghost which is at the present time more dangerous is that we have accustomed ourselves to think of Greece in terms of the past. We are surprised that she survives. Each new proof of her vitality comes as a shock. We do not take it as a matter of course. This would make little practical difference if the Greek question were settled once for all, and the race were able without our help or hindrance to develop in its own borders and under its own flag. It is serious, seeing that there are few questions so unsettled as the Greek question, and that the fate of about three million Greeks depends on the coming Peace Congress. There is no race so many of whose members may remain unredeemed unless great efforts are made by us to free them. And we historians, whose craft comes from Greece, and who owe her such incalculable debts, are not a little to blame. With the exception of one or two men, we in Great Britain have treated the Byzantine period with neglect. Is there any side of history on which, since the days of Gibbon, less specialist research has been done? Is there any in which what work has been done has been so little popularised? Of the thousands of administrators, publicists, and schoolmasters who have passed through our Honour History Schools during the last forty years, few indeed have any conception that it was Hellenism that vitalised the decaying organism of the Roman State and made the Byzantine Empire possible; that it was Hellenism that saved Western Europe from Tartars and Turks as surely as ever it did from Darius and Xerxes; that under Turkish rule from end to end of the old Empire Hellenism was persistent, omnipresent, bidding its time till it could fulfil once more "the great idea" of the race. It is mainly an accident of geography that the War of Independence succeeded where it did, and that it is the Greeks of the Balkans and the Islands, and not the Greeks of Constantinople and Asia Minor, who are the free Greeks, the Greeks of the Kingdom, the citizens of an Hellenic State. The War of Greek Independence did not break out in what we now call Greece. The standard of revolt was first raised on March 6th, 1821 (N.S.), by the leader of the Constantinople Greeks, Alexander Hypsilantis, whose father and grandfather had held the highest offices open to Greeks in the Turkish Empire and been Hospodars of Moldavia and Wallachia. The nucleus of his forces was the "Sacred Band" of 500 youths of the great Greek families, of the Phanar and elsewhere, who had studied in Europe and returned at the call of the Hetairia, the national society that organised the revolt from the vantage ground of the neutral Odessa. Hypsilantis's object was to attack the centre

of government; but the Turk showed that he was not yet the Sick Man of Europe. The attack was easily defeated, and the Sacred Band put to the test the motto of their standard, the Spartan shield's "*ἡ τὰν ἡ ἐπὶ τὰν*," (either this or upon this). That revolt was expected both in Constantinople and in Asia Minor is proved by the drastic steps taken to forestall it. On Easter Sunday the Greek Patriarch was hanged from the gate of his palace, and the Archbishops of Ephesus, Nicomedia, and Anchialos shared his fate. Massacres were at once organised at Constantinople, Smyrna, Magnesia, Adrianople; and the better-known sack of Chios, which occurred the following year (1822), showed how futile it was at that time to attempt to destroy what was still a great military Power. It was only at the circumference that the revolt could succeed, and it was there that it developed. But it has never been sufficiently emphasised that the raising of the Sacred Standard at Kalauriya on April 6th, 1821 (N.S.), the day which has become the national birthday of the Greek Kingdom, was a month later than Hypsilantis's action in crossing the Pruth. The Greek War of Independence could be better described as the Revolt of the Byzantine Empire from the Turks.

If we emphasise the need of thinking of the old Byzantine Empire as one, and in a very real sense as the homeland of the Greek race, it need not be imagined that we are encouraging some wild and impracticable imperialism. No sane Greek or friend of Greece wishes to extend Greek rule over non-Greek peoples. The romance which dwells upon the last Christian service in St. Sophia on that fatal night of May 28th, 1453, and laments the unhappy Constantine as the true successor of him who fell at the Cannon Gate, need not be discouraged as a dangerous political day-dream. For Greece to claim kinship with Byzantium does not carry with it the same implications as for Italy to represent herself as the heir of the Empires of Rome or Venice. Rome and Venice won by right of conquest. Their power of assimilation was remarkable, but there was not time for it to be complete. When the end came they had only reached the stage that Hellenism had reached in Asia Minor in the time of the Diadochi, if not in that of Alexander himself. But, happily for Hellenism, it had then long centuries before it in which this process of assimilation was completed by a Roman rule which was ever more becoming Roman-Greek. When the Romani had become Romaioi the Byzantine Empire was an accomplished fact, and represented not conquest of subject nationalities by an imperial race, but, to use current terms, the self-determination of a homogeneous area. The true analogy is not the Roman Empire of Hadrian or the Venetian Hegemony of the Levant, but the unified Italy of Sulla or of Victor Emmanuel.

In none of the three was the race unmixed. Just as there were Gauls north of the Padus who became good Romans, so men of Armenian and other stock assimilated Hellenism under the Diadochi and the Roman Governors of Asia and Bithynia, Cappadocia and Pontus. Not only was there time for such assimilation, but

there was plenty of pure blood near to do the blending with. Constantinople itself had never been anything but Greek, nor yet had the coastlands of the Pontus, the Propontis, and the Ægean.

The history of language will serve as a test of the general truth of the argument. The Italic dialects, like the Greek, underwent synthesis and merged into the dominant *κοινή*. But the history of Greek presents no analogy to the converse process, the analysis of Latin into the Romance languages. While Latin, in spite of the unifying influence of ecclesiastical and legal rite, was breaking up into French and Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, and Roumanian, the Greek *κοινή* developed so imperceptibly as almost to seem to stand still. In the remote villages of Cappadocia and Pontus, separated for centuries from contact with the rest of Hellenism, and representing the extreme limit of Greek dialectical variety, the simplest peasant can still understand the normal Attic idiom of speech or newspaper. It is indeed significant of the fact that from the days of Justinian to the early Middle Ages Asia Minor and not the Balkan Peninsula was the true centre of Hellenism, that it was in Cappadocia and Pontus that there developed in the twelfth century the only Hellenic parallel to the "Chanson de Roland" and the "Nibelungenlied," the romantic folk-poetry that has only recently been discovered dealing with the achievements of the Byzantine Counts against the Saracens.

The language question (*γλωσσικὸν ζήτημα*), the struggle between the pure language (*καθαρεύουσα*) of public life and newspaper, and the popular language (*δημοτική*) of poetry and ordinary speech, generally strikes the foreign observer as showing the exaggerated value which Greek public opinion places on continuity with the classic past. No doubt that is the point of view from which the Greek Conservative does in fact look at it, and it would be easy to show that in thus antagonising the written and spoken word he is artificially hampering the growth of a literary idiom. For our present purpose it is rather significant that such a struggle is possible at all. Of what other living language in the world could it be said that the writings of 1 A.D., 500 A.D., 1000 A.D., 1500 A.D., and 1900 A.D. could all be read, with perhaps half an hour's special preparation, by the scholar trained in the writings of 500 B.C.? The "great idea" comes to this, that the homeland of the Greek race, like the Greek language, is a unity, and that only one corner of it has yet been freed from alien rule.

We are on the eve of the Peace Congress, which is to leave no ragged edges, which is to allow every race to sit under its own vine and under its own fig-tree. What is to be our attitude to the seven separate problems in which the fate of the Byzantine Greeks is involved?

Can we even now think of the Greek race as a whole? Can we discount the geographical accident that there is already a country called Greece and that there is no unredeemed district like Armenia, Arabia, and Syria that bears its ethnic name? Can we save our statesmen from the vague muddled notion that the Greeks are a wandering race of merchants and sailors, that they never have

and never will remain confined within their natural borders, and that their outlanders are too scattered to form a basis for territorial changes?

It is not to be expected that in all of our seven problems the case for our Byzantines is equally strong, or that they can be solved by the same methods. We may group them thus:—

- (a) North Epirus.
- (b) The Dodecannese.
- (c) Cyprus.
- (d) Pontus and Cappadocia.
- (e) Thrace.
- (f) Constantinople.
- (g) Smyrna.

In the space at our command we must deal with them succinctly, and there is perhaps something in favour of a statement which arranges the matter in a tabular form.

(a) North Epirus.—This question is placed first because it stands in a different category from the others, and is to some extent an exception to our argument. The Hellenism of the Southern Albanians cannot be claimed as Byzantine in the full sense of the word. Hellenic schools at Janina do, indeed, date from the early Middle Ages, and Moschopolis, a town in the disputed area destroyed by the Northern Albanians in 1770, was a great Hellenic centre from at least the beginning of the seventeenth century. On the other hand, the Greek language never took such a hold here as it did in other parts of the Byzantine Empire, and assimilation was not complete. A large part of the population, who have Hellenic sentiments and wish to form part of the Kingdom of Greece, speak Albanian in their own homes. So, however, do M. Repoulis, the Minister of the Interior in Venizelos's present Cabinet, General Danglis, Commander of the Greek Army, and Admiral Condouriotis, Commander of the Greek Navy in the Balkan Wars. The argument, therefore, is that the analogy for North Epirus is not Ireland but Wales. The civilised and Christian South of Albania prefers to maintain its connection with Greek culture, which has been strong and continuous at least since the beginning of the eighteenth century, rather than to throw in its lot with a rude and predominantly Moslem Centre and North. In the disputed districts there were, before the Great War began, 122,000 Christians against 101,000 Moslems. It is clear that this mixed population has a right to have its voice heard. It must not against its will be included in Albania merely on the language test. A true *plébiscite* uninfluenced by an interested Power would be acceptable to Greece. It would be extraordinarily foolish if Italy, posing as the Protector of Albania, were permanently to estrange her Greek neighbour by opposing this view. The Epirotes showed in 1914 that they valued their Greek nationality enough to fight for it.

(b) The Dodecannese.—This question concerns Italy more directly than that of N. Epirus. The islands contain 102,000

Greeks and not more than 12,000 of other nationalities. They were taken by Italy from Turkey in the Italo-Turkish War, and are nominally being held by her as a pledge till Turkey fulfils the stipulations of the Treaty of Lausanne which concluded that war in 1912. During the Balkan Wars of 1912-13 the Greek Fleet, which had command of the sea, would without doubt have incorporated these islands in Greece if they had not been held by Italy. At the time Italian statesmen gave full assurances that Italy could not permanently annex a purely Greek population. None the less it is a bad omen that Signor Bissolati gave the other day to the correspondent of the "Morning Post" (January 6th, 1919), as one of the reasons for his resignation from the Italian Cabinet, his opposition to the policy which he ascribed to Baron Sonnino of permanently annexing the twelve islands. It may be remarked in passing, that Venizelos has publicly stated his willingness that Italy should retain the harbour of Astypalea, an islet of about 2,000 inhabitants, if she wishes it for strategic reasons. There is no doubt it will be much harder for Italy to retain the twelve islands in flagrant defiance of the principle of nationality if we ourselves give up Cyprus.

(c) The population of Cyprus is about 300,000, of whom 235,000 are Greeks. The Greeks make a point of acknowledging the justice and mildness of our government, but there is no doubt the inhabitants are united in their desire for union with the Mother Country. There is no danger for the Moslem minority. Greece has proved her tolerance in Eastern Macedonia, where Moslems have been elected to Parliament and have held the mayoralty of important towns such as Drama. It is impossible to believe that the conditions of modern naval warfare make the possession of Cyprus strategically necessary for us. We offered the island to Greece in the autumn of 1915 on condition of her entering the war. There are no adequate reasons for holding back now. It would be a consistent vindication of the principle of nationality at our own expense, which would have a great influence on the decisions of other Powers.

(d) Pontus and Cappadocia.—There is a large and important Greek population of some 350,000 in the Vilayet of Trebizond on the shores of the Black Sea. It is natural that a movement should have arisen among these Greeks, representing, as they do, an ancient and prosperous part of the race, that the old independent State of Trebizond should be recreated. They must certainly not be left to the mercy of the Turks, who have persecuted them during the last few years. It would probably be the wisest course to include them in the new State of Armenia, and to lay it down that the Greek language should be one of the official languages of that State. On the Southern side the 70,000 Cappadocian Greeks of the Adana district should also be incorporated in the New Armenia. If, as we shall suggest later, the western part of Asia Minor is joined to Greece, there ought to be no spirit of irredentism created by such an arrangement. The interests of

the two States would not clash, and the Pontus and Adana Greeks should form a link between the two rather than a cause of discord.

(e) Thrace.—It cannot be too clearly understood that the bulk of the population of Thrace is not Bulgarian, but partly Turkish, partly Greek. The Vilayet of Adrianople contains 508,000 Turks, 366,000 Greeks, and 107,000 Bulgars. It is true that a mass of these Turks, the so-called Pomaks, living in the Highlands between the Nestos and the Maritza, are Moslems who speak a Slavonic dialect infused with many Turkish elements. It is not certain that they are ethnologically Bulgarian, and their physical characteristics, especially their light or reddish hair and delicate features, are not like those of their northern neighbours. Their religion is in any case more important to them than their language, just as is true of the Moslems of Crete, in spite of the fact that in their case race as well as language is certainly Greek. So little did the Bulgarians consider before the Balkan Wars that they had a majority in Thrace that when, in 1912, the Greeks and Bulgarians formed a joint Committee for running anti-Ottoman candidates for the Turkish Parliament, it was agreed on both sides that the Coalition should put forward seven Greek candidates and only one Bulgarian.

It is therefore natural that at the present time there is a strong movement in Greece for the incorporation of Thrace. Unless the Greek population in Asia Minor and elsewhere receives such ample space for its development that there would be a chance of sectors of the race which are still unredeemed being bought out and settled within the new territory of the Kingdom, this Thracian policy must be vigorously pressed. It cannot be denied, however, that Greece would thus acquire a bad and sprawling frontier, and that the feud with Bulgaria would inevitably be crystallised and perpetuated. It would be particularly unfortunate if Greece were tempted to accept what may well prove to be the white elephant of Thrace instead of solid concessions in Asia Minor. There are indications that such an offer may be made in not entirely good faith. There exist certain financial interests, especially in France, which shrink from touching Turkey in Asia, and at the same time would not be sorry to cast a fresh apple of discord among the Balkan States, so as to put out of the question an ultimate Balkan Confederation. Weak States are exploited more easily than strong, and the concession hunter would be sorry to see a peaceful and united Levant. An alternative solution would be to assign Thrace temporarily to the jurisdiction of the Great Power who is the mandatory of the League of Nations for Constantinople and the Straits. Bulgaria must be punished for her treachery and cruelty to Serb and Greek, and proposals such as those made the other day in the "Times" by Mr. J. D. Bouchier, which would reward Bulgaria by giving her territory which before the war belonged to Serbia or Greece, are merely farcical. It would be quite another matter to put Bulgaria on her trial for five or ten years, and to hold out the prospect to her that if she showed a change of heart and abandoned once for all her schemes of domination, the League might propose to the

other Balkan powers a scheme for a Balkan Federation. If the other Powers were willing to enter into such a scheme, and Bulgaria consented to buy out as much of the Greek population in Thrace as wished to move into Greek territory, the mandatory Power might be asked to hand over Thrace as a Bulgarian sphere for expansion within the new Confederation. This suggestion would not, at the present moment, be acceptable to Greece, but none the less it might well be in her ultimate interests.

(f) Constantinople.—It has been assumed in the preceding section that Constantinople and the Straits will be entrusted to a mandatory Power. If this is the United States the solution would be acceptable to Greece. It goes without saying that Greece would dearly love to be entrusted with Constantinople herself. In Constantinople the Turks only number 308,000 and the Greeks 235,000 out of a total population of 841,000; for the whole vilayet of Constantinople, and for the neighbouring Governments of the Dardanelles and Ismid, the proportions are about the same. When the Allied fleet anchored before Constantinople the enthusiasm of the Greek population was unbounded. Greek flags flew everywhere. A great picture of Venizelos was set up in a public place with a candle burning before it, and guarded night and day by Greeks. In Pera, as the Turkish paper, "Aksam," put it, "most of the shops which we thought Ottoman till to-day bore upon their doors the inscription, 'Long live Venizelos!'" On the other hand, the figures show that the Greeks are not in a majority. Greece would not wish to take on herself the burden of Government of Constantinople and the Straits except at the definite request of the Allied Powers. She would be perfectly willing that her nationals should live under the ægis of a protecting Power, confident that hers is the only race native to the soil, that it would expand and thrive under free conditions, and that at no long distance of time an internationalised Constantinople would mean a Greek Constantinople. If the United States refuses to undertake this duty the only other solution is that Greece should be entrusted with it at once. It is unthinkable that that great Christian population should be left to the ever unrepentant Turk. It is devoutly to be hoped, it may be remarked in passing, that on either alternative the oldest and greatest Cathedral in Christendom will be returned to its rightful owners.

(g) Smyrna.—The most ancient and most persistent centre of the Greek race is the Sandjak of Smyrna, with a population of 449,000 Greeks as against 219,000 Turks. There is no doubt whatever that this district is in every sense of the word Greece, and should be made the nucleus of a great stretch of territory placed under the control of the Greek Government. On the north it should touch the territory of the mandatory state, and include the purely Greek portions of the vilayet of Brussa. To the east it should include the whole river valleys of the Hermus and Meander, and touch the southern coast east of Rhodes. It would actually include a large portion of the one million Greeks who inhabit

Western Asia Minor, and the policy of Venizelos would be to attract to it the Greeks who are at present outside those boundaries by buying out the members of the Turkish population who wished to follow their flag and offering their estates to Greek immigrants. It appears unfortunately to be the case that we are still possessed by an inexplicable tenderness for the Turk. When the first British monitor reached Smyrna, the Greek population raised flags and indulged in enthusiastic demonstrations, but the commander of the English boat at once issued a proclamation advising the discontinuance of all expressions of sympathy with the Allied cause. The Turks construed this action naturally as a snub to Greek aspirations, and have since assumed so menacing an attitude that, as the Greeks say, it would appear that they were imposing their will as victors on a conquered Entente.

This is a long programme, it may be said. To carry it out may be just on ethnological grounds; but it will mean effort on our part, material sacrifice in the case of Cyprus, the throwing over once for all of our traditional policy of maintaining the Turkish Empire, discussion—perhaps sharp discussion—with Italy. What have the Greeks done, you may ask, to deserve it? Are they in character and capacity fit for these new responsibilities? What has been their record in the Great War?

The remarkable thing about Greece's record in the War is not that Constantine had so much influence, but that he had so little; that his influence was finally overcome long before the Entente had proved itself the winning side. Constantine had all the glamour of the popular King and the prestige of the successful general. His affability and attractive manner had given him a personal hold both on officers and men. He was "the eagle's son," as the popular song entitled him. His belief in the invincibility of Germany was backed up by a General Staff that had carried the country victoriously through two wars, and the fate first of Serbia, then of Roumania, the two countries nearest and most similar to Greece, seemed amply to justify it. Is it not amazing that Venizelos not only won the elections of 1915 but, as events showed, kept the majority of the country with him all the time? Never did he doubt that he had the country with him. When, in the autumn of 1916, he realised that the letter of the Constitution enabled an autocratic King to violate its spirit indefinitely and with impunity, he, too, abandoned Constitutional methods. It was no easy thing, as he himself has said, for the Prime Minister of a modern State to become a Revolutionary. There is no need to repeat the story of the Provisional Government at Salonika, the Triumvirate that split Greece into two opposing camps. By the end of November, 1916, over one thousand officers of commissioned rank had joined the volunteer forces at Salonika, and every part of Greece which the Entente allowed to join Venizelos had, in fact, joined him. That was the miserable part of the business—that from October, 1916, till June, 1917, the Entente bound itself by a grotesque covenant with Constantine that the Venizelist movement should not be allowed to encroach upon the mainland of Old Greece. In vain we Philhellenes laid before our Government the figures

of the previous elections, showing, for instance, that in Thessaly, which the Entente prevented Venizelos from touching, his friends had been, and almost certainly still were, in a huge majority. It was not till France forced the situation, in June, 1917, that it was discovered by the event that we had been right all along, and that the mainland of Greece was as ready to receive Venizelos as the Islands. If Greece did not formally, as a Sovereign State, enter the war till the summer of 1917, it was the Entente itself that was responsible. The Greek nation entered the war in the autumn of 1916, when Venizelos raised his flag at Salonika.

Although, too, Constantine prevented Greece from conferring the incomparable services that it might have been her good fortune to render if she had forced the Dardanelles in the spring of 1915, she did, in actual fact, render a greater service in the last phase of the war than has been yet realised. The news of the crushing defeat of Bulgaria this autumn was so presented to the public eye in Western Europe that it appeared as if the Serbian Army, supported by a few contingents from the Allies, defeated Bulgaria. Serbians are some of the most magnificent fighters in the world, and the achievement of the Serbian forces in this last offensive was as fine as anything they have ever done. Their army, however, had been so denuded by battle, famine, and pestilence that it was, in fact, only six divisions strong. The Greek forces consisted of ten divisions* and formed one-third of the total Allied Army in Macedonia. It was quite reasonable and seemly for the small French and British forces, consisting of eight and four divisions respectively, to subordinate their share in the operations to that of the Serbs. It was a graceful tribute to a glorious Ally. It was, however, extraordinarily unfortunate—and we believe this view is shared by the Serbs themselves—that the British and French *communiqués*, in their anxiety not to obscure the glory of Serbia, fatally obscured that of Greece. Without the presence of the strong Greek forces the Macedonian offensive would have been impossible. Bulgaria would not have fallen. Turkey would not have been isolated, and we should be, perhaps, even now hammering away on the Western front in the squalor of a fifth winter.

"Blood has peculiar virtues," and when we are casting the accounts of the sacrifices each one of the Allies has made in the war, we must place on the credit side to Greece not only the heavy losses of the Greek divisions, both in the Doiran sector in the last offensive, and in the earlier battle of Skra di Legen, but the terrible persecution which the Greek race has had to suffer in Turkey ever since the war began. The sufferings of Belgium are infinitely light compared with those of the Greeks in Asiatic Turkey. Not only have countless individual murders been committed, but the populations of whole townships have been deported *en masse* from the coast into the interior, in circumstances of foul brutality, for no other reason than that it was taken for granted that the whole Greek race were natural Allies of the Entente. It is interesting to

* In the *Times* of January 7th, I overstated the Greek forces in the field. See the *New Europe* for January 23rd.

notice that the official reports of Greek Diplomatic and Consular Agents on these persecutions, which have been lately published in an English form by Constable, were originally written in 1915 and 1916, when Constantine was in power, and when it was against his interest that public opinion in Greece should be excited against the Turks and their allies. The reports were, indeed, squashed and pigeon-holed till Venizelos came back to power, and they are free, therefore, from any suspicion of being written for propaganda purposes in order to magnify the sacrifices made by Greeks in the common cause. Greece, therefore, has not come off lightly in the war, but has paid the price, both in blood and misery.

Finally, there are points in common between Greece and Great Britain which exist between us and few of the people with whom we are allied. We are both a "Nation of shopkeepers," and yet we have not been found wanting in the day of battle. We are both—and here there is no "and yet"—a nation of sailors. At our best we turn out something of the same type of man. English archæologists who know their own country have often been startled by the resemblance between the Greek peasant and the best type of English artizan. If Venizelos strikes us as just the man we should like our own statesmen to be, it is not a little, I think, because we find in him no discordant note to our own ideals. Is it because we ourselves have been brought up upon the thoughts and the lives of the ancient Greeks, and that descendants by adoption and descendants by blood cannot be alien to each other? Certain it is that if we genuinely understand and admire the modern Greek at his best, he in his turn has a natural friendliness to us which hardly a nation in Europe has. The vote of sympathy to England passed in the Greek Parliament at the most unpopular moment of the Boer war finds an echo in the hospitality, and, indeed, the affection, that is shown in Greece to the individual Englishman. At the present moment rich Greeks have left the sum of £80,000 for the establishment of what they call a Greek Eton on one of the small islands off the Attic Coast, and a committee of representatives of both countries is now at work to organise both this public school on the English model, and two big day schools, one for boys and one for girls, in Athens itself, in which the education is to be of the English type, and to begin with, at any rate, conducted by English teachers. Even those who may raise eyebrows at such an imitation of institutions which we ourselves often criticise, must at least confess that it is not everywhere that we find appreciation of what is so typically English. I was reading the other day the account of a lecture given in a town in Peloponnesus this last spring by a local notable on his return from serving on the Salonika Front. The title of the lecture is "Why the English are what they are." There is a long description of the influence of our sanitary arrangements, our baths, and our shaving on the Greek private. "One night in April," says the Greek officer, "the men of my company had succeeded in a very dangerous attack, and occupied the enemy's trenches. All night the whole force stood to their arms,

some guarding their new position, and others digging themselves in. The very first report made by the N.C.O.'s next morning was that their men wanted to shave." "Yet," adds the officer, "they had all shaved the day before the attack!" Similarly, there is much talk of the influence of the English breakfast, with its tea, marmalade, and bacon. The Tommy's habit of bathing anywhere and everywhere, "even if the water was cold as snow," proved for some time a stumbling block to perfect imitation, but the Greeks finally compromised on hot baths, and tubbed by companies twice a week. Above all, Mr. Papantoniou was eloquent on the merits of the young English officers, "not one of them older than 26," who gave them so freely and pleasantly of their three years' lore of war. "One would have thought one was not listening to an English aristocrat, but to some hoary-headed shepherd of the mountains of Arcadia." Finally, he is full of admiration for our tenderness to the individual. "In a village near the front a woman was dying in childbirth. The English doctor called to attend her saw that an operation was necessary, but had not with him the instruments nor possessed the specialist skill. He telegraphed to the English headquarters at Salonika that a woman would die in childbirth if not operated on within three hours. In a quarter of an hour an English aeroplane brought to the village a gynæcologist with his instruments, and the woman was saved. Why, you may ask, he goes on, was a gynæcologist attached to an army? It is because the English know that war is not carried on in a desert, but in the midst of a civil population, and that they have a duty to it."

It is a nation which understands us and likes us, whose rights we have a chance of vindicating at the Peace Congress. It is a nation to whose past, indeed, we owe much, but which has much more in common with the future than with the past. The Greek race is not decadent, not on the down grade, but on the up grade—fertile, progressive, constantly expanding. It has at its head one of the great men of the century, a man who fulfils in his own person the ideals and aspirations of the race. He has pinned his faith to us, and has stayed true to us "in good report and in evil." Are we going to justify his faith in us and prove him right to his fellow-countrymen? Or shall we reward Bulgaria for her treachery and her bitter cruelty? Or let ourselves be wrapped in the grave-cloths of these secret treaties by which in pre-Wilsonian days the Allies bartered away unwilling populations in their search for the Balance of Power? Or shall we, "with our gold to give," deny Greece little Cyprus, and thus make it possible for Italy to deny her the twelve islands? Or shall we indulge a tenderness for the noble Turk which marred our diplomacy for half a century, and that when he has had the consistency not only to massacre Greeks and Armenians, but to torture English prisoners? If by the decrees of the coming Congress any of the Christian races are still left under Turkish rule, we shall, indeed, have lost the Peace.

RONALD M. BURROWS.

THE HISTORIC CLAIM OF BELGIUM TO LUXEMBOURG.

IF Belgium had been as well known in 1830 and 1839—the opening and the closing years of the London Conference—as she became in August, 1914, 380,000 of her children would not have been torn from her side by the Treaties of April 10th, 1839, and consigned to alien rule. They were men who had fought and bled in her cause. They left her unwillingly and with grief, under threats from Great Powers, friendly as well as antagonistic, that it is painful to recall. When the moment of reunion arrives the world will not be left in doubt as to where their hopes and affections have lain all these years. This will be especially true in the case of Luxembourg, the southern half of the old Belgian province and duchy that was bartered by Prussian guile to cover up its own robbery of the German possessions of the Nassau family.

The first kingdom of the Netherlands was the arbitrary creation of the Congress of Vienna in 1814-15, which paid no attention to Belgian desires or opinion in handing over the destinies of three million people to a foreign and unknown prince. The levity with which human beings were passed from hand to hand was matched by the freedom with which parts of their territory were assigned on new conditions to owners who had no claim to them. A solemn treaty, the most voluminous and imposing on record, gave its sanction to one of the most barefaced thefts in history. Prussia had appropriated the German possessions of the House of Orange-Nassau, and she kept them. But her diplomatists manœuvred so well at Vienna that the purely Belgian province of Luxembourg was detached from the new kingdom of the Netherlands and given to William I. as his personal possession in compensation for the loss of his German possessions of Nassau-Dietz. To make the barter clear this new duchy was classed as a unit in the German Confederation, so that the king who lost his seat in the Diet as Count of Nassau, recovered it as Duke of Luxembourg. But the European luminaries in the sphere of International Law had failed to appreciate two consequences of this change. A considerable part of Belgium was detached from the main body of the nation and placed in its external relations under a strange and repugnant jurisdiction. The old pretension of the Germans to regard some parts of the Belgian provinces as their fiefs, which had been repudiated by the House of Burgundy in the 15th century, was admitted almost without protest in the case of Luxembourg, and remained for a hundred years one of the chief causes of disturbance in Europe.

A third innovation was subtly introduced by Prussian intrigue in 1815. The Duchy of Luxembourg passed under the Salic law established in all German States, and thus females were excluded from the succession which passed to them in all the other component parts of the Netherlands kingdom. Moreover, the Salic law had never prevailed in the old Duchy, which had been governed on two memorable occasions at least by its own duchesses. It, therefore, followed that whenever a queen should reign at The Hague the Grand Duchy would pass to the nearest German male

cousin, and this is what actually happened in 1890 when William III. was succeeded by his daughter Wilhelmina. It is therefore perfectly evident that the Prussian scheme of 1815 entailed as its inevitable consequence some day or other the partial disintegration of Belgium.

There was yet another consequence of the changes in 1815. The fortress of Luxembourg commanding one of the easiest roads into France, that used by the Crown Prince in 1914, was taken over and entrusted to a Prussian garrison. That *régime* lasted until the second London Conference of 1867 effected the neutralisation of the Grand Duchy and the dismantling of the fortress.

We must now return to 1830, when the ephemeral kingdom of the Netherlands after a brief existence of fifteen years was split in twain. The rising of the Belgians against the Dutch in August of that year was supported enthusiastically and energetically by the people of the so-called Grand Duchy. The Luxembourgers shared with the citizens of Brussels and Liège the glory of expelling the Dutch troops from the greater part of the southern provinces. They were prepared to share the fate of other Belgians in defeat, but no one deemed it possible that the penalty of victory would be to separate their fortunes and destiny. The success of the revolution rendered it impossible to coerce the Belgians into a fresh union with the Dutch, but none the less there was a feeling of irritation against them in all the chancelleries for having brought to naught the pet scheme of the older diplomatists in the kingdom of the Netherlands. From this cause arose the desire manifest throughout the long negotiations to take nothing from Holland that could be refused, and to give Belgium nothing that could be withheld.

The Belgians demanded the old Spanish provinces in their integrity, the southern portion of the Circle of Burgundy, and they defined their claims under three heads with great clearness. They demanded: (1) Dutch Flanders on the left bank of the Scheldt; (2) the whole of Limbourg, including the towns of Maestricht, Ruremonde, and Venloo; and (3) the whole of Luxembourg. We are only concerned here with the last-named, and of all their demands this was the one which they were most confident could not be refused. Were they not in absolute possession of the whole of the province outside the German fortress? Had they not the unanimous support of the whole population? Whatever happened in the other cases, Luxembourg certainly could not be detached from the main stem. To make doubly sure they even announced their willingness to take over "the obligations involved towards the German Confederation."

But while the Belgians were thinking of right and justice the diplomatists were set upon what is called a "transaction." If the Belgians were to have things all their own way they thought there would soon come an end to protocols and notes and conversations across the green cloth. So the *gros bonnets* set to work to devise fresh traps and entanglements that would leave endless matter for elucidation by their successors, to say nothing of the bad feeling engendered between neighbours, and it must be admitted that rarely have plenipotentiaries displayed so much ingenuity and

employed so much casuistry in attaining their end as they did in this case.

The Dutch King was to lose his Belgian subjects—this much was clear before the close of 1830; but he was entitled to compensation. The province or duchy of Luxembourg was, by the Twenty-four Articles of November 15th, 1831 (embodied in the final Treaties of April 19th, 1839), divided into two parts, the northern half falling to Belgium, and the southern remaining with the king as his personal Grand Duchy. He thus retained half of the Belgian province which through Prussian influence had been assigned to him in 1815 as compensation for the robbery of Nassau-Dietz by Prussia herself. Some persons might have thought this enough, not so the five plenipotentiaries in London. They also could be generous with other people's goods. They gave the king "a territorial indemnity in the province of Limbourg," which effectively disposed of the Belgian claims to Maestricht, &c. The only difference between the two transactions was that while the Grand Duchy continued to be transmitted as a Nassau family possession, the king was left the right to reunite his "territorial indemnity" to Holland, which he eventually did.

But for the Belgians there was nothing but disappointment. All their claims were swept aside, and one-half of their own Luxembourg was left them by way of compensation. There remained, indeed, one slender ray of hope. The Dutch king in a fit of obstinacy refused to accept the Twenty-four Articles that were in reality so favourable to him. Seven years passed without his giving a sign of acquiescence, and during all that period of suspense Luxembourg remained in the hands of the Belgians. Nowhere was their administration more firmly established or more cordially supported by the people themselves. In the national Parliament Luxembourger deputies were the most eloquent advocates of the union of what was then and is still called the Greater Belgium. It really seemed as if the right of possession would supersede the paper, partitioning territory and distributing subjects without any regard for national or individual sentiments. Suddenly, in March, 1838, the King of Holland realised his mistake and declared that he would sign the treaty. In vain the Belgian representatives pleaded that he had delayed too long, and that the instrument had required prompt acceptance to preserve its force. The objection was brushed aside. Belgium made a fresh effort. She offered to buy out the Dutch king for the then immense sum of sixty million francs. Lord Palmerston was the only person to show the slightest sympathy with the proposal. He agreed to submit it to the Conference, but the other representatives refused so much as to receive it.

All efforts by diplomatic channels having failed, the treaty was submitted in accordance with the Belgian Constitution to the Chambers for their sanction. The debates that followed were the stormiest in Belgian history. Both in the country and in the House the feeling was in favour of rejection at all costs. Ministers resigned and none were found to take their places. It fell to a Luxembourger to plead for the acceptance of the treaty even though

it consigned the bulk of his fellow-countrymen to a foreign yoke. The name of J. B. Nothomb, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, deserves to be remembered with gratitude by Belgians and Luxembourgers alike for having secured by his eloquence and sound reasoning the acceptance of the distasteful treaty in the face of a hostile majority. His peroration contained the remarkable passage: "Belgium has done all that she could. It is from France and from England that history will demand an account."

Luxembourg passed then into two different spheres. One-half, with its capital at Arlon, remained Belgian; the other, with the city of Luxembourg, reverted to the Grand Duke. For nearly thirty years nothing happened to draw attention to the affairs of this principality, which came to be regarded as a sort of holiday ground or little Switzerland by the Dutch people. But in 1866 the defeat of Austria by Prussia was followed by a European crisis which revolved round Luxembourg. Napoleon III. wanted compensation for Sadowa, and the only place where he seemed likely to get it was in the Grand Duchy. A Conference met in London for the purpose of averting a general war. The result of its meetings was that the fortress of Luxembourg was dismantled, the German garrison withdrawn, and the Duchy proclaimed a neutral State on the guarantee of the signatory Powers.

The most interesting part of the episode is the least known, and in a strictly diplomatic sense it remained unrecorded, for it finds no place in the protocols or acts of the Conference. The hopes of the Belgians revived, and the possibility of a recovery of what had been surrendered in 1839 was seriously entertained by the Government. A very able Belgian official, Emile Banning, drew up some masterly papers on the whole question from mediæval times, and a certain line of action was projected. The Austrian Minister, Count Beust, had proposed the reunion of Luxembourg and Belgium, but unfortunately his scheme was vitiated by the suggestion that France was to be compensated by Belgian cessions in Hainaut and Namur. The Belgian Government rejected the proposal as soon as it was informed of it; but on the other hand it continued its own proceedings. A definite offer to take over the Grand Duchy on certain terms was drafted for submission to the Conference, but unfortunately at the last moment M. Frère Orban, the Prime Minister of the Day, ordered that it was only to be produced "if someone else broached the subject," or "in the event of a deadlock." As neither contingency arose no one was aware of the interesting document that the Belgian member of the Conference had in his pocket. It is significant to find, however, in the frank Memoirs of Emile Ollivier, that the old French Premier thought that with a little more courage the Belgian proposal would have been adopted.

The Salic law which barred Queen Wilhelmina from the succession in 1890 had to be waived in 1912 when the Nassau family died out in the male line. The eldest daughter of the last Duke William, Marie Adelaide, was the reigning Duchess when the Germans violated the neutrality of Luxembourg on August 2nd, 1914, and according to all accounts they found her more accommodating than her subjects. But, despite that violation, the Luxem-

bourg Government took up the position of a neutral in the world conflict, and the Allies have made it a point to respect its decision. It was not difficult to do so while the Grand Duchy was remote and behind the enemy's front. The situation has necessarily become more delicate since some of the Allied forces have garrisoned the Principality. But President Wilson's statement last year that "Luxembourg is a neutral State, and that it alone must decide its own future," indicates the lines upon which a solution will be found. The one obvious conclusion is that no form of coercion will be resorted to to compel the Luxembourgers to decide one way or the other.

There are some considerations which may be set forth as bearing indirectly on the main question. The disarmed neutrality of the Grand Duchy did not avail it against German ambition. While it was overrun by immense armies it must not be forgotten that in addition to its own troubles Europe was deprived of that peace security which was so elaborately created in 1867 for the permanent closing of one of the historic routes of invaders in Western Europe. That "scrap of paper" was the first to be torn in fragments, and the lesson is one for the Western Powers as well as for the Luxembourgers. In that sense the American President's statement does not cover the whole situation, and it is no use pretending that the Luxembourgers are free to annex themselves to Germany. Not that there is any chance of such an untoward incident. The signs are all the other way. The customs union with Germany has been repudiated, the German control of the Grand Ducal railways is loudly denounced, and the Grand Duchess has been led to the conclusion that her further stay in the country is not desirable. Indeed, it seems probable that before these lines are in print she will have quitted it for ever.

It is said that there are three currents of opinion in the State, one in favour of reunion with Belgium, another in favour of autonomy, and yet a third in favour of absorption in France. The *plébiscite* that will no doubt take place eventually will decide between the three suggestions. But, without attempting to pre-judge the issue, the old historical claims of Belgium are such as attach to no other outsider. It was a hard fate that separated them in 1839 after they had fought side by side in a common cause. Geographically—and physical conditions count—it is far more natural for Belgium to have a southern frontier in the Moselle than for France to cross it in search of a less clearly defined boundary north of it. From the same point of view the establishment of Belgian authority on the left bank of the river seems to be the natural and essential complement of the extension of French jurisdiction on the right bank.

But the majority may favour the experiment of a separate autonomy coupled, as has been suggested, with an economic union with Belgium. The objections to this course are that it would not be a permanent solution, but rather an experimental step towards a closer and more intimate political connection with Belgium later on. The advocates of this compromise dwell on the long period of nearly eighty years since the two States were com-

pelled to separate, and the different economic position that has arisen since the mineral resources of the Grand Duchy began to be developed. There is no means of judging which party is the more numerous, the one that favours open and complete reunion with Belgium or the other that inclines to a separate and home administration; but at least both are equally in favour of an economic and customs convention with Belgium. This will be the test of the good faith of the new self-appointed Grand-Duchess. Despite the innocent form of her declaration it is hard to believe that a truly national ruler could have been nurtured in such a German hot-house as the Grand-Ducal palace. Not by words, but by deeds will she be judged. Will she repudiate, and quickly, the Conventions binding her country to Germany by the old Customs and Railway Unions? In the meanwhile it will be wise to regard her interposition in a complicated situation as the outcome of a pro-German Palace intrigue. The principal advocates of the conjunction with France are those Luxembourgers who have served so gallantly in her Foreign Legion, but it must not be forgotten that a not less numerous contingent has served and is still serving in the Belgian Army. It is also believed that a pro-French propaganda will not be regarded with much favour at Paris, where the desire in all authoritative circles is to see the Grand Duchy freed from all German connections and joined with Belgium.

The ties that kept Luxembourg in close and unbroken association with the rest of Belgium for nearly a thousand years are still strong, and it is to be remembered that the Luxembourgers have across the frontier a brother population of a quarter of a million which has never ceased to be Belgian. They are the true link between the two communities. The northern Luxembourger is not to be distinguished from any other Belgian, and if his sympathy with his cousins from whom he has been separated for only two or three generations is not so great as to lead him to abandon Belgian nationality for a new and restricted Luxembourg commonwealth, he is waiting to receive them with open arms on their return to the fold. The people of Luxembourg cannot but feel the necessity of attaching themselves to some sympathetic and congenial association that will promote their moral and material development and prosperity. They need security as well as autonomy. They want to be rescued from the obscurity to which their isolated position has so long consigned them. Joined to Belgium they will share her advantages, and, while retaining their own individuality, they may take in a wider horizon. Nor must Europe altogether forget those general interests that have been referred to in this paper. The reunion of Belgium and Luxembourg is calculated to strengthen the barrier neutral State which was to have been one of the guarantees of European peace, and for that reason, if for no other, the natural gravitation of the two Belgic communities towards each other claims our sympathy and support.

DEMETRIUS C. BOULGER.

TYROL AS A REPUBLIC.

SCANTY as is the information to hand it seems to be a fact that the little country of Tyrol, with scarce a million of inhabitants, has declared itself a republic under the presidency of a Dr. Schraffl. It has done so rather than join German-Austria, that embryonic entity which is being hotly wooed by the German federation, and thus escape becoming part and parcel of a conglomerate republic in which Prussia, we can be sure, will ever manage to remain the dominant, if heartily detested, master. This dramatic severance of ties that for five hundred and fifty-five years bound the Tyrolese people with bands of pathetic loyalty to the Habsburg dynasty is a rather remarkable venture on the part of such a small people, the bulk of whom are peasants dwelling in more or less remote alpine glens. It may prove, as I shall attempt to show, to have more important bearing upon the future peace of central Europe than would appear at the first glance.

Tyrol, as it is perhaps needless to point out, is divided by the Rhaetian Alps into North Tyrol and South Tyrol, the Brenner Pass affording easy and strategically important means of communication between the two halves. The inhabitants of the former are wholly Teuton, and so are those of the northern part of South Tyrol, a few enclaves of Slavs and Vinosts being too insignificant to count. The southern part of South Tyrol, the Trentino, which in the past has been the constant scene of political unrest or Irredentism, has an Italian-speaking population whose sympathies, on the whole, follow the language spoken there. While the Trentino will, of course, become part of the kingdom that bore the chief burden in the struggle with Austro-Hungary, the final fate of the German-speaking part of South Tyrol, which the Italians desire should also become part of Italy, is at present still in the clouds.

According to the third clause of the Armistice with Austro-Hungary, the crest of the Rhaetian Alps shall form the northern boundary of the territory which the Austrian troops are to evacuate and the Allied troops—as a matter of fact the Italian troops—are to occupy. The next clause gives the Allies the right of movement over all roads and waterways of the monarchy, and to occupy all strategic points they may consider necessary throughout Austro-Hungary. At the time the Armistice was signed (Nov. 3rd) this last was an essential clause, for Germany had not yet surrendered, and by it we would have been able to attack Germany along the Tyrolese-Bavarian frontier. The event that occurred eight days later, and which no doubt was brought about to some extent by the dread of thus having to defend a further front, removes the fourth clause from practical politics.

Many competent judges claim that on military grounds the crest of the Rhaetian Alps, including the Brenner Pass, should be the future frontier of Italy. It is this view which may prove dangerous to the future peace of districts that once formed the Austro-Hungarian monarchy, and hence also of the rest of Europe, and in support of this contention I venture to submit three reasons in order to demonstrate that the German-speaking part of South Tyrol

should be allowed to continue as an integral part of the new republic.

First, by depriving the republic of the whole of South Tyrol up to the watershed we take from it the most valuable part, thereby reducing it to such an extent as to make its existence as a separate political entity quite impossible. As a foregone consequence it would drive the republic into the expectant arms of Germany, and thereby increase to a considerable extent the area and population of that country—the Tyrolese would be an ever-defiant one—about the last thing to which the Peace Congress should give its consent.

Second, were this really to happen, it would make it impossible to turn Tyrol into a buffer state between Germany and Italy, obviously a most desirable safeguard to ensure the future peace of Europe, and an even more necessary precaution than is the shaping of Poland into a *glacis* between Germany and Russia.

Third, by handing over to Italy the whole of South Tyrol the Peace Congress would not only repudiate the principle of self-determination, but it would deliberately create an ever dangerous nest of sedition and political unrest, a second Trentino in fact, with the difference that the Tyrolese, as their history shows, are not afraid of odds, and are splendid fighters when their liberty is attacked. Napoleon, in 1809, had to send his best general, his bravest troops, and to call in the assistance of Bavarian and Saxon armies before he could subdue Andreas Hofer's peasant troops. The South Tyrolese population of the Vintschgau, the Upper Adige, the Eisack, and the Pusterthal, with the towns of Meran, Bozen, Brixen, Sterzing, Brunneck, and Lienz, are, however much they hate the Prussian, Teuton by race, and would never willingly become Italian citizens. Europe has surely had enough of irredentism and racial schism! Even our politicians would not force the town council of Belfast upon the people of Cork. Racial antipathy, such as exists between the two peoples in the occupied zone, is a ponderable fact which no Peace Congress can abolish, and when we remember that they have been fighting each other at intervals for the last eighteen hundred and fifty years it would be reversing the lessons of history to expect fraternal feelings between them.

What is now happening to the Trentino has been long expected by those who knew the country at all well. A dozen years ago I wrote in the last of the half-dozen volumes dealing with Tyrol, its people, and its sport, with which I have cumbered library shelves, when adverting to this possibility: "Were it not probable that the future will witness a separation of the Italian-speaking part of Tyrol from the Austrian conglomerate . . . the strife of nationality is likely to bear results of wider imperial consequences."* Those wider consequences have occurred, and have swept the Habsburgs from their throne.

There is one, and only one, boundary that in future should separate the two peoples, and that is the *Sprach Grenze*, or lingual frontier. In South Tyrol it is unusually sharply defined, in most cases a mountain ridge keeping the two elements apart as effectually

* *The Land in the Mountains*, 1907, p. 121.

as were it a wide ocean. Only in the main valley of the Adige is there a zone a few miles in width where the dwellings of the two peoples intermingle, and there the segregation, with the efficient assistance of impartial commissioners, can speedily be brought about, for both nationalities desire nothing more fervently than to see each other's backs. The Boundary Commission, when it once gets to work on the spot, will therefore have in South Tyrol, so far as the terrestrial division is concerned, an easier task than awaits it further east on the Hungarian and Transylvanian fronts, where numerous enclaves, many of them with a bi-lingual population, will make the demarcation of equitable frontiers more difficult. Even in the intervening Austrian provinces of Carinthia, Carniola, and South Styria, respective claims of the Slavs, Slovaks, Italian, and Teuton elements are likely to give trouble, if one's own experiences in quite a small way are any guide. Having for many years shot over the mountains of these comparatively unknown districts, and held shooting leases in two and three-tongued zones, one obtained an insight into the mentality of antagonistic races when brought into contact with each other. In any case the separating lines will in these districts be very "wavy," winding in and out, and contrasting in this respect strangely with the frontiers in newer worlds which follow for thousands of miles geographical degrees.

Tyrol, owing to its position astraddle the lowest and first-used pass over the main chain of the Alps, has since its conquest by Drusus and Tiberius ever held a more special place among the countries of Southern Europe than was quite warranted by its size and population. There were good reasons for this, but it would take up too much space to explain them, for in view of the possible future of Tyrol a glance at the present aspect has a better claim for a hearing. Of the inner life of the Tyrolese English travellers used to see but little from railway and hotel windows. Mine is, as I may be allowed to explain, rather a more intimate acquaintance. Attracted as quite a young man by the unusually good big-game shooting to be had on its mountains, often at quite nominal cost, I have passed over a score of summers and autumns in one of its historical castles, from the windows of which I could, in old days, catch glimpses of chamois and deer. It was acquired by my mother in the year 1873 as probably the first of the old country seats to pass into English hands, and at her death it came to me. What with constant shooting expeditions, leasing of ground when free shooting became scarce, competing at rifle shooting matches, research work in its castle and town archives, and Tyrolese servants in the house, one got to know the natives as only residents can. If I add that for the last half century there has been no people in Europe, excepting the French, who entertained a more inveterate hatred to the *Sau Preuss* (pig of a Prussian), the term usually applied to them, a sympathetic fellow-feeling became established between the natives and the stranger within their mountains.

Then came the war, which caught my wife and me in our summer home, and with it a telling test of the friendly feeling hitherto evinced by the natives. It soon became plain that the peasants were against the war,

in spite of the rabidly pro-German press and the smaller officials and tradespeople in towns among whom Pan-Germanism, thanks to clever propaganda, had gained ground. At first headquarters in Vienna placed no difficulties in our way, and we could have left the country; but then it suddenly dawned on them that I might know too much regarding strategical points, and on the eve of our departure we were telegraphically stopped and interned in my own place. Count Toggenburg, the kindly Governor of Tyrol, showed us on all occasions friendly consideration, and after a while, with a permit from him, I was allowed to use even my pre-war free pass over the State railways, and was permitted to visit Vienna in order that I might present my case personally to the Minister of War, who finally, in the last days of April, 1915, gave me permission to leave the country. Previous to this, owing to the efforts of Mr. Nelson O'Shaughnessy, at the time Acting U.S.A. Ambassador in Vienna, whose unwearied kindness I cannot sufficiently acknowledge, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, by a formal *Note Verbale*, had guaranteed the safety of my property, as that of a British subject.

Very warm sympathy was shown us by the peasants round us. A few days before our departure five of the leading *Bauern* from a neighbouring valley where I used to shoot came down from their distant homes to express to us in their simple way how deeply they deplored that we were leaving the country on account of "this miserable war which no peasant desired," and hoped that we should return as soon as possible. Similar feelings of regret at the break in the old friendship between England and Austria were entertained by those of the aristocracy who were not mixed up with politics or official life. One of the highest magnates wrote to press upon me a loan of 5,000 *kronen*, "in case you should be placed in financial straits by not being able to get money over from England," and though I did not, of course, avail myself of it, it was a kindly act of a chivalrous enemy. So far as I know, all other English people in Tyrol were treated decently, and in those of the prisoners' camps which I visited, where there were hundreds of Serbian and Russian civilian prisoners, I also saw no sign of undue severity or real hardship such as our people were made to suffer at the hands of the brutal Germans. Of what happened after our departure I have no knowledge except that the other day a leading British General on the Austrian front wrote to me that "in Austria British subjects and British property have been respected as much as possible." This seems to be borne out by the fact that when the enemy quartered officers in my place the usual billeting allowance was paid to the caretaker, and for the fittings of three bathrooms commandeered by the Government indemnity was offered.

Since the Napoleonic wars the Tyrolese were wont to look upon the English as friends in need. For in those distressful days, when the Bavarians and Saxons barbarously ravaged the main valleys and towns, British gold alleviated great sufferings. On the other hand, neither Church nor people ever forgot or forgave the ignominies thrust upon Austria by Bismarck's victory in 1866. It is therefore safe to say that, looking at the future of the new little

republic from the point of view of the Peace Congress, none of the miniature states on whose existence that body will presumably sit in judgment invites closer scrutiny than does Tyrol. If the country is allowed to abide by its present form of government it has the making of a strategically valuable buffer-state for the safeguarding of our Italian ally against vengeful aggression on the part of Prussia.

As I suppose that few of your readers have ever heard of Dr. Schraffl, the new President, it may be of interest to some to learn a few particulars concerning his personality, though what little I can tell about the man dates back to pre-war days, when I occasionally ran across him and another member of his family. Schraffl is a man of the people, the son of hardworking, frugal peasant folk who live in the village of Münster, the châteaux of which, clustering round the needle-shaped church spire, I could see from my windows which overlook a wide stretch of the Unter-Inn valley. A man of about forty-five or fifty, tall and robust, with a good flow of language, he was for years one of the leaders of the *Christlich-Soziale Partei*, that strange combination by which the Church of Rome successfully created an antidote to the free-thinking Socialists in a country that has ever been the staunchest stronghold of its tenets. Dr. Schraffl, like many an ambitious peasant's son, is *ein Studirter*, viz., he has passed the University and obtained his degree. But instead of entering the Church, as do most of his class who have passed that ordeal, he took to politics, and in the Unter Innthal none could touch him when it came to the vote. Of his political reputation I know nothing but what the local press, according to its respective party, reported, for as a stranger I have always given him profession a wide berth. Possibly he may make quite an efficient leader of the new republic, for nobody can know better what is required by the bulk of the population, the peasants.

A near relative of his—I think his brother—Michael Schraffl, is a builder in a small way in the nearest village to my place, and a man I had often occasion to employ to do repairs. To show what a versatile people the Tyrolese are, the fact may be mentioned that this man gained fame that far overshadowed that of Dr. Schraffl in a vocation of a somewhat singular kind. Michael was a man of even finer physique, with a peculiarly benign facial expression, which, with an inborn dramatic talent, gained him wide celebrity at the Passion Play held every ten years at Brixlegg, where he took the leading part of Christ. Indeed, many people who had also seen his better-known Oberammergau *confrère* pronounced Schraffl's impersonation superior to that of the Bavarian. Like the performances in the latter place, the Brixlegg play took up the whole of every Sunday throughout the summer. Some years ago English friends who had followed with much interest the performance and were full of praise wanted to know all about the principal actor's personality. In response I took them to a window on the highest floor from where they could, at a distance of a few yards, watch on my roof the impersonator of Our Saviour of the previous afternoon in the act of nailing down shingles which the man who had acted Joseph

was handing up to him on his giddy perch. Seeing that both men had contravened orders and were working without life-lines, and that a short time previously the son of one of Schraffl's neighbours had been instantly killed by a fall from this very roof, I told them to get their ropes. Down came the laughing answer: "Oh, you needn't fear for us, the old Joseph and I are not going to break our necks with four more Sundays to play."

The absence of change which marks the life of all isolated rural populations has made the Tyrolese a singularly conservative people, who stick with almost unequalled tenacity to their ancient ways and principles; hence the present evolution is all the more remarkable and significant. Unlike the mercenary Swiss of German Switzerland, who in their race for the stranger's gold have lost their once sterling individuality, the Tyrolese peasant was, up to 1914, as self-reliant and frugally self-subsisting an individual as could be found anywhere. It seemed to me that, were the whole of Europe to be suddenly submerged by the ocean and only Tyrol sticking out of the water, the peasant would neither starve nor undergo unusual privations. Their form of government was a patriarchal one by what one might call self-optioning parish councils. The government of the country interfered with them only when malpractices of one sort or another imperilled public welfare. If this occurred the authorities put in one of their own trained officials at the expense of the parish—a costly disgrace all tried to avoid—who remained in power until the needed reforms or abuses had been seen to. When money was needed for any public works the State advanced the necessary sum at a low rate of interest, with a sinking fund by which the debt was wiped out in twenty or thirty years. By these simple means isolated little villages were enabled to provide for themselves waterworks, electric light, and telephone exchanges that would have done credit to much larger communities. The presence of abundant water-power throughout the country of course facilitated these installations, and kept rates very low. Thus, to give but one instance, the *yearly* rental charged for an electric lamp varied from five to six shillings, even if that lamp were never put out, meters not being used; thus the street lamps were left burning night and day. In many villages the intermediate steps in domestic lighting, viz., petroleum and gas, never came to be used, and these communities discarded the mediæval tallow wick and at a bound reached modernity, as if the products of the Standard Oil Trust, and those other abominations, gasometers, had been inventions of another planet.

An English writer well acquainted with Tyrol wrote lately: "However it may fare with the mountaineers of Tyrol after this prodigious struggle between gigantic forces has been decided, they are a brave and faithful race, and we trust they will preserve their freedom and individuality." This wish those who know the country will echo.

WILLIAM A. BAILLIE-GROHMAN.

SINN FEIN TRIALS AND PARLIAMENTARY DISQUALIFICATION.

THAT curious manifestation of the social and political unrest now unhappily predominant in every country which is peculiar to Ireland, *Sinn Fein*, has presented many striking incidents in its meteoric career. From a small, neglected, and despised band of enthusiasts it has become the most powerful, or at any rate the most active and the most vociferous, political force in the country; it has set up a "Provisional Government"; it has "run" a dangerous rebellion; it has added two words of Erse to the languages of civilised man; and it has swept the country from end to end at the recent election. Nor is that all; for it is now in a fair way to raise a question of constitutional law and of parliamentary practice of such interest as to merit a passing notice.

Briefly, twenty of the newly-elected parliamentary representatives of Ireland, as a result of their participation in the outbreak of 1916, were sentenced by courts-martial either to death or to long terms of penal servitude, and the question is, were such members disqualified from being elected, and are they now disqualified from taking their seats?

Let us first glance at that rock on which was founded until recently all our rights and all our liberties—the Common Law. What says Coke? "Every person," we read in his terse, emphatic language, "that is attainted of high treason, petit treason, or felony is disabled to bring an action, for he is *extra legem positus*, and is accounted in law *civiliter mortuus*." And again, "A man attainted of treason or felony is not eligible: for concerning the election of two knights, the words of the writ be, *Duos milites gladii cinctos magis idoneos, et discretos eligi fac*, and for the election of citizens and burgesses the words of the writ be, *Duos, &c., de discretionibus et magis sufficientibus*, which they cannot be when they are attainted of treason or felony." One can well imagine that a modern returning officer would consider his office no less hazardous than onerous were he called on to draw so nice a distinction as that involved in deciding whether the successful "knight" was either "*idoneus*" or "*discretus*"—and, still more, both—even although that worthy was no longer "*gladii cinctus*," but only the modern analogue, a K.B.E. In both these passages Coke uses the word "attainted," and therein lies the attitude of the elder world to the question. Attainder implied corruption of blood; "it is the crime not the punishment that makes a man infamous," as Chief Justice Willes put it. But attainder and its consequence, corruption of blood, are now abolished, and the Act that relegated them to the museum of legal antiquities, the Forfeiture Act, 1870, settled the law and made the disqualification a resultant of the two forces, the crime and the punishment. This statute enacts that if any person convicted of treason or felony for which he shall be sentenced, amongst other punishments, to death or penal servitude, shall become, and, unless he shall have suffered the punishment or shall receive a free pardon from the King, shall continue, incapable of being elected or sitting or voting. This raises two questions: were

these twenty persons "convicted"? and, if so, have they received a free pardon?

As to "conviction," the facts are that eighteen of the twenty were tried by field general courts-martial, the others by general courts-martial. So much for the courts. By what law were they tried? To this there are but two possible answers: either by what is popularly called "martial law," or under the Defence of the Realm Acts. In the issue of this Review for September, 1916, certain considerations were adduced to show that there is not in this country any such "law" as martial law in the sense known among Continental nations of "a suspension of constitutional guarantees"; that "martial law" is but the descendant of "marshal law," the law of the King's Marshal, that is, the regulations for enforcing military discipline; that its place is now filled by military law, that is, the Army Act, 1881, and the King's Regulations; that these apply, and apply only, "to persons subject to military law"; that by the Common Law force of however great severity can be, and, indeed, must be, used to put down felonious violence; that when such violence has been suppressed the wrong-doers must be tried by a jury of their peers; that if tried otherwise (at any rate, if the Civil Courts are open, as they certainly were in Dublin) the proceedings are illegal; and that if a sentence of death be pronounced and executed such execution is technically murder.

Now, the reports of these trials fail to disclose any reliance on the Defence of the Realm Acts; the proceedings appear to have been founded on martial law alone. Assuming, then, that there is such a "law," and that it can be "declared," and, if declared, is binding on British subjects, and assuming that, if declared, the proper Courts for enforcing it are courts-martial, it is no stretch of legal principles to say that such courts are bound by their own process and cannot exceed, or stray outside, them. This leads back to the question of the courts that sat in Ireland in connexion with the rebellion. The constitution of field general courts-martial is governed by section 49 of the Army Act: they derive, and can derive, their existence from no other source. This section provides that when a complaint is made to an officer commanding troops in any country beyond the seas, or commanding troops on active service, then if the officer be of opinion that it is not practicable to hold a general court-martial he may convene a field court-martial; but the complaint must be that an offence has been committed by a person subject to military law. Neither of these conditions precedent is found to exist in these cases. The rebellion had been already suppressed, and that the convening of a general court-martial was perfectly within the range of the practical politics of martial law seems evident. Nor, on the other hand, were the prisoners persons subject to military law; who such persons are is laid down with great precision in the Army Act; there are twelve classes so subject as officers and eleven as soldiers; but among them is none wherein could be included Irish enthusiasts, Irish peasants, and the denizens of the purlieu of Dublin masquerading as the armed forces of the Provisional Government of the Irish Republic. Wolfe Tone's case settled that point beyond dispute.

As to the two persons tried by general courts-martial, the case is no whit the better; the Army Act grants the power to convene such courts only for the trial of persons subject to military law.

If, then, "convicted" in the Felony Act mean, as it must mean, convicted by a court of competent jurisdiction, these twenty stalwarts (with two exceptions to be mentioned in a moment), when they present themselves at the table of the House of Commons—if they propose to confer that honour on that alien assembly—will be able to advance an arguable case against anyone that seeks to exclude them on the ground that they were convicted of treason or felony. They will materially strengthen their case by vouching section 41 of the Army Act, which expressly prohibits a court-martial from trying a person subject to military law (and *à fortiori*, one may add, a person not so subject) for treason, murder, treason-felony, and certain other offences committed in the United Kingdom; they will doubtless clinch it by showing that this section of the Act appears under the highly suggestive sub-head "Offences punishable by ordinary law."

It must be admitted that the word "conviction" is of somewhat doubtful import. But the cases in which its meaning has come up for elucidation in the Law Courts turned rather on the questions at what stage in the proceedings a conviction had taken place, whether after verdict and before judgment, or only after judgment; and whether a verdict of guilty followed by letting out on recognisances without punishment was a conviction; no case seems to have decided what form of trial, if any particular form, is essential. But here Blackstone helps us: "Conviction," he says, "may accrue two ways; either by his confessing the offence and pleading guilty, or by his being found so by the verdict of his country." This savours of good law, and it is no reply to say that persons found guilty and punished by courts of summary jurisdiction (that is, without a verdict of their country) are, as they undoubtedly are, "convicted," for this jurisdiction is, on the one hand, purely statutory, and, on the other, within its ambit, an overthrow of the common law. And if it be rejoined that courts-martial also are statutory and their jurisdiction an overthrow of the common law, the sur-rejoinder is, Yes, within their ambit, that is, when they try persons subject to military law. So, then, our aspirants to parliamentary honours can be of good heart; they can wield the stout staff (perhaps they would prefer to call it, the pike) of the Army Act in the strong arm of the Common Law.

It may be, however, that the trials in Dublin did not profess to administer martial law at all, at least not martial law pure and undefiled. It is possible that they derived, or professed to derive, their powers from the Defence of the Realm Acts, and certainly there were some features in the trials of the two new Members of Parliament that were condemned by general courts-martial that give a certain plausibility to this contention. That these now famous statutes have been held to contain many powers that even their authors would have hesitated to claim for them is all but universally admitted. But still even the most autocratic Act of Parliament must be construed according to the plain meaning of

its terms. Now, what the Defence of the Realm Consolidation Act of 1914 does is to give power to the King in Council to issue regulations for securing the public safety and the defence of the realm, and by such regulations to authorise the trial by courts-martial of persons committing offences against the regulations. Passing by the question whether this did more than alter adjective law by permitting trial by courts-martial in certain cases where trial would otherwise have been "by the country," it is clear to demonstration that the only persons affected are those who have committed offences against the regulations. Do the regulations prohibit treason, felony, treason-felony, or any such offences? If the official manual containing the regulations is to be the final authority, by no means. Powers to search for petroleum, powers to destroy strange dogs, powers to close places of public amusement, powers to prohibit whistling for cabs—these and the like high themes form the burden of the regulations' song. True, there are two, Nos. 8g and 8gg, that are printed blank; what hidden terrors lurk within these vacant spaces it passeth the imagination of man to surmise; mayhap they contain all the crimes in the calendar; but the ghost of Hood might be forgiven for suggesting that the second has some cryptic reference to horse-stealing! The obvious inference seems to be that the authors of the Acts knew—albeit by unconscious cerebration—that sufficient unto a common law crime was the common law thereof. So yet again the suppliants at the table of the House may claim that they were never convicted within the terms of the Felony Act.

Admitting, however, that they were so convicted, the second question remains: Have they received a free pardon? Pardons, as is well known, are of two kinds, free pardons and conditional pardons. Most commonly the former are granted when by some mischance there has been a failure of justice leading to the conviction of an innocent man, but there is no limitation to the Royal prerogative of mercy, and a free pardon may be granted to one justly condemned. The effect, as Chitty says, "is not merely to prevent the infliction of the punishment demanded by the sentence, but to give the defendant a new capacity, credit, and character." It is otherwise, at any rate in theory, in the case of conditional pardons; here the offender agrees that on condition of his having his sentence altered, either in nature or in duration, he will endure some other disability not imposed by the court; in terms, he enters into a bargain with the Crown. The commonest example of this is where one sentenced to death has that punishment remitted on condition that he goes into penal servitude for life; as Maitland puts it, a man has a *right* to be hanged, a right on which, we have the authority of Major Arthur Griffiths for saying, at any rate one prisoner insisted—in America. The Sinn Fein prisoners who were set at large some time ago—including the twenty additions to the collective wisdom—certainly did not receive only a conditional pardon, and so whether a conditional pardon comes within the purview of the Felony Act is irrelevant. What they did receive was described as "an amnesty"; this is not the definite language

of courts of law, but the vague language of harried politicians, and in connexion with martial law and the Defence of the Realm Acts vague language has a peculiar appropriateness and a peculiar utility. A decision of the Courts of the State of Georgia has, however, condescended to be more precise: "A pardon," it says, "is remission of guilt: an amnesty is oblivion"; the lesser, remission, may fairly be taken to be submerged in the greater, oblivion. Whether, however, the Executive could "amnesty" without an Act of Parliament is another question, but beyond doubt it could so pardon.

It would, therefore, appear that while it is at least doubtful whether the persons concerned were ever so convicted as to render them disqualified for election or for sitting in Parliament, there seems no doubt that if so convicted they have received a free pardon.

With reference to two, however, Mr. de Valera and the Countess Markievicz, no such difficulties arise. Both were sentenced to death, the sentences being reduced to penal servitude for life, doubtless, in the case of the Countess Markievicz, *pour encourager—les Allemands*. Both are disqualified on the ground of alienage, conviction or no conviction. It must give rise to thought among the militant advocates of woman suffrage that after many months of strenuous window-breaking and determined hunger-striking the fine flower of the "suffragette" movement, the rare and refreshing fruit of the Election of 1918, should in the end fail to attain Nirvana because she married a husband who overlooked the propriety of becoming naturalized in what she would doubtless have considered an alien country!

The opponents of those of the Sinn Fein candidates that had been tried by court-martial must have been singular exceptions to the alertness characteristic of parliamentary agents in all countries and at all times. In very deed they were caught napping. They should have read up the history of John Mitchel's attempt to enter Parliament, and have profited thereby. Mitchel was convicted of treason-felony in 1848, and sentenced to fourteen years' transportation to Van Diemen's Land. Not long after his arrival there he was let out on parole; in 1852 he determined to attempt escape, and rushing one day into the local police office he threw down a document in which he announced that he desired to withdraw his parole, and "to offer myself to be taken into custody"; he then dashed out, took horse, and was never captured. The Assistant Police Magistrate, when called on for an explanation, in the course of his report, later on presented to Parliament, said, not without reason, that he could only characterise the expression just quoted "as a deliberate lie." Mitchel succeeded in reaching the United States, where in due course he was naturalized. In February, 1875, he stood as Parliamentary candidate for Tipperary, and was elected. The House of Commons promptly resolved that being an alien he was disqualified—under the Common Law, be it noted, for the Felony Act, 1875, did not apply—and ordered a new election. Mitchel stood again. But this time his opponents were more wary; they put up a dummy candidate, gave notice of the disqualification to the Returning Officer, at the polling-booths, and generally

throughout the constituency. Again Mitchel was at the head of the poll. Thereupon a petition was lodged, demanding that not only was he disqualified, but that notice of the disqualification having been given, the votes given for him were thrown away and that therefore his opponent was elected. This argument was referred by the election judge, the well-known Judge Keogh, to the Court of Common Pleas, where it prevailed. It may be of interest to recall that the subject of all the pother, *Hibernice*, showed a fine contempt for the proceedings by incontinently dying sixteen days after the election and about eight hours before the petition was lodged, thereby giving rise to a second "leading case."

If, then, the opponents of Sinn Fein desire to add two to the number of their sadly depleted ranks in Parliament, they need but to move in the House that Mr. de Valera and the Countess Markievicz are disqualified on the ground of alienage, and then, if the House declare that such disqualification exists, and notwithstanding the disqualified candidates stand again, put up candidates of their own, give due notice of the disqualification, and victory will crown the manœuvre.

That the outbreak in Dublin in 1916 was stained by detestable crimes no one, whatever his political views, now attempts to deny; that many of these crimes were rendered doubly atrocious by a cowardice well-nigh incredible among a high-spirited people; but if the questions raised in these pages should ever come up for decision, and be decided, as alone it seems possible they can be decided, in favour of the Common Law of the kingdom, there will be a credit entry in the Sinn Fein accounts; the supporters of that principle will be able to say, "However inadvertently and however unwillingly, we have struck a blow in favour of the reign of law, we have not entirely lived for 'ourselves alone.'"

J. O. HERDMAN.

THE KHANATES OF THE MIDDLE EAST.

THE gradual disintegration of the Turkish Empire in Europe within the last seventy years has provided an abundance of problems for the diplomats, and turned the Balkans into the cockpit of Europe, where oceans of blood have been shed. Though only an indirect cause of the present struggle, Balkan troubles have always been a slumbering volcano, threatening at any moment to burst out. To-day the same difficulties, on a vastly greater scale, threaten to emerge from the collapse of Russia. From Vladivostok to the Baltic, from the White Sea to the Persian Gulf, things are in a melting pot, and unless due consideration is given to Asiatic questions, the strong currents of racial and religious feelings now beginning to flow represent potentialities of conflict and discontent. An eminent British traveller in Central Asia seventy years ago found national feeling among the Uzbeks in deep slumber. To them their Khan was all Wisdom and Power, and it was even at that early date conjectured that sooner or later the country lying between Orenburg and Afghanistan would be added to the Russian Empire. Nothing reminded the traveller of

“ Chiefs of the Uzbek race,
Waving their heron crests with haughty grace.”

The Russian policy of territorial expansion, as far as it concerned Central Asia, has been passive as well as active. But though the year 1802 saw the soldiers of the “ White Tsar ” at Kishk in the north of Afghanistan, and Krasnovodsk on the shores of the Caspian, it is to be questioned whether Russian administration showed any signs of permanency.

From very early times the Russian system of government in the mid-East has been lacking in that moral impulse which is the best guarantee of peace and submission. On the Steppes, Turcomania, Russian Turkestan, and over the Khanates, no real exertions were made for the amelioration of the people. After the Russian victories protocols were signed, which contained most liberal terms for the vanquished; but in practice only concessions were granted, though points of importance to the people of Turkestan were almost always regarded by the Russians as involving Imperial prestige. Their non-fulfilment of peace terms, as also the heartless treatment of the subdued people by the Russians, has even made their rule in the Middle East politically unstable.

In the beginning of the war the attitude of the Khanates was anxiously discussed. It was pretty generally admitted by students of mid-Asiatic questions that if ever the Khanates participated in the conflict it would be the result of external pressure, and of whispers to the Khan that his opportunity had at last arrived to revive the glory of his ancestors. For a time Turkestan and Bokhara meditated, but it was not long before Russian prestige had been shaken to its foundations. Bolsheviks won the armed assistance of the people of Central Asia, and the war, as predicted before, was declared against the “ infidels.”

For successive centuries the Khans had been autocratic rulers,

and it was not until the Russian penetration that their liberties were curtailed. At the outbreak of this war civilisation first entered the gates of Khiva, where a form of representative government was installed. Bokhara followed suit, and the Kirghiz and the Turcomans, overthrowing the Russian yoke, once again breathed the air of freedom. The whole mid-Eastern question was altered, and politics were moving rapidly in the land which had for long remained a tortoise of the East. Abdollahed, the Khan of Bokhara, received representatives from the Russian Tartar communities round the Ural Sea and Kazan, seeking his assistance and sympathy for the Pan-Turanic movement. To all these overtures the Uzbeks gave their hearty approval; for the promoters of the scheme had founded it on sound principles. It was pointed out that a marked affinity existed amongst all the members of the Tartar race: in language, religion, and traditions they were alike. A claim was put forward to demand from Russia and other Powers the policy of "non-interference and self-determination." The Pan-Turanian movement had been erroneously taken to be allied to German designs. The project is said to have made no great progress; but the mere fact of launching such a scheme is indicative of a political awakening in Central Asia.

At the time when the Turkish advance was progressing favourably through the Caucasus, and their goal was Enzeli on the Caspian shores, the situation had assumed a very menacing aspect, and it was seriously thought that a German invasion might be effected in the Mid-East through a landing at Krasnovodsk, and that by capturing the Trans-Caspian Railway a strong army might strive to reach Merv. There was ample justification for believing that such an invading army might be received by the Central Asiatic people as deliverers. The success of the scheme was directly affecting the peace of Afghanistan, nay, that of India. The problems demanded the overcoming of many difficulties; but bearing in mind that the ground was already prepared in Central Asia, the project certainly stood a good chance of success, as it would have been launched when the bulk of the Indian Army was fighting in Mesopotamia and Palestine, and would have imposed very great pressure upon Anglo-Afghan resistance. Berlin was not unaware of a region which lay fallow for German energies, nor perhaps were their sympathisers in Bokhara unacquainted with the possibility of such a move. The Trans-Caspian Railway, which was still held by the adherents of the old Russian *régime*, was to be secured. The Russian defenders were few, and the Bolshevik party succeeded in capturing the line up to Askabad.

Hostilities in France have ceased, but Russia is still in the turmoil of war, and Central Asia has not yet seen peace. The sentiment of the people, which had for long been smothered under Russian control since their acquisition of the Steppes in 1863, has at last found an opportunity to vent itself, and it may be that Turcomania on one side, and the Tashkent Provinces on the other, will end in setting up petty chiefdoms, as was the case in 1867 and 1873. But to leave all consideration of Central Asia alone, and to permit perpetual fighting, is perilous, and may give birth to an era

of confusion in the Mid-East, and insecurity on the borderland of India. In any consideration of Central Asia it must be remembered that the sympathy of the people must be won before Russia or any other Power undertakes to exercise influence in the administration. The Russians have so outraged the feelings of their subjects that the return of Turkestan to Russian control is a matter of some doubt. An attempt to establish Russian rule over the Khanates may well take the form of a new campaign. Through five long years of warfare the people of Central Asia have become conscious of national feeling. The Khan of Bokhara had overthrown Russian sovereignty, and a great deal has happened in those regions to slacken the Russian grip.

Before going further we may sketch Russia's method of absorbing independent nations below the Ural Sea. One may date Russian penetration into the East from the sixteenth century, when the minds of European readers had been poisoned by fabricated accounts of Moslem atrocities. Russia undertook to play the rôle of cavalier of the West, and, having inscribed civilisation on her banners, marched on to the vast tracts of Siberia. The lower and middle Volga had already been annexed, and the Crimea met with the same fate later. But one step, according to the time-honoured Russian policy, justified another, and attention was bestowed on filling up the gap between Siberia and the Black Sea. It was the turn of the Nomad Kirghiz to lose their independence. But Russia was the torchbearer of a great movement; the poor Kibitka dwellers (tent dwellers), who were alleged to be oppressed by their own aristocracy, had to be civilised. Resting-places were erected throughout the Steppes at Russian expense so that the caravans coming up to Orenburg should find every hospitality. Later armed Russian soldiers escorted the merchants in their passage through the Steppes, and the troopers were quartered at the resting stations. This humanitarian work after a time assumed the phase of an intense hospitality towards the Kirghiz chiefs. The Russian rouble worked wonders, and presents and gifts were generously distributed as a token of friendship of the White Tsar. Gradually the unpretentious rest-houses were exalted to more imposing forms of mud forts, and cannons peeped out of the loopholes. The Kirghiz had hardly come out of the vodka stupor when they witnessed their country pass under Russian administration.

Western Europe at the time cared little as to what happened in the unknown lands of Central Asia. The Russian penetration, on the other hand, was indeed welcomed by some in this country as well as in France. A faction believed in the philanthropic exertions which Russia was making in the East, while the diplomats watched the advance unconcernedly for the mere reason that Russia was better kept off European politics. Russia was, however, well aware of her position, and an indifferent attitude adopted by other nations encouraged her to move forward. Tashkend was subdued, and the Russians began to cast eyes upon the Khanates of Khiva, Bokhara, and Khokand.

Great Britain awoke to a sense of watchfulness, and an explanation soon came from Russia to show the justification of their

Tashkend acquisition. The document consisted of three clauses, one bearing upon the other. The whole, however, amounted to this: that as Russia had acquired territories up to Lake Issyk Kul in the North-East and the Ural Sea in the North-West, they found it essential that a link of fortification should be made continuous between these two points. Further, that a country which not only provided provisions for garrisons, but might also facilitate Russian colonisation, should be reduced. It closes with a very modest clause, asserting that the establishment of that line was necessary with a view to check all "inducement to go on from repression to reprisal, which might result in endless extension." Further assurances were given to the European Powers, and more particularly to Great Britain, that the Russians would not cross the Oxus for the purpose of territorial expansion. This line of policy may not have satisfied those in this country who were aware of Russia's dual policy—and their number was very small—yet it worked in favour of Russia, for an unconcerned attitude was once again adopted by the general public.

While matters were allowed to slumber in other countries Russia was busy consolidating her position in Central Asia. A pretext "to cross the Oxus" towards Khiva was soon found, and a small detachment of the Russian soldiers, it was announced, was pursuing Khivatie robbers. Before any adequate information could reach Europe the Russian columns were within a few miles of Khiva. The Khanate was reduced, and the victorious army galloped its chargers upon the inoffensive Turcomans, who were brought to feel the heavy weight of the Russian yoke. The siege of Geok Teppe and the "extermination of the Turcomans" are matters too fresh in the memory to require recapitulation. Khiva and Turcomania were undisputed Russian possessions. The importance of these conquests had riveted the attention of many in this country to a watchful waiting for further developments. Russian policy, from being a mere uplifter of the miserable Asiatics, became a vast scheme of world power; and, as events show, the benign influence of Russia has brought the wretched Tartars to a degree of affluence never before experienced. At a later period it took the form of exploitations and progressively exorbitant taxes.

Great Britain, for whom the drift of events in Central Asia portended no good, now became alive to the gravity of the situation. As a counter movement, Lord Auckland endeavoured to approach the rulers of the Khanates and inform them of Russia's designs. Bokhara was allied, and a treaty of commercial as well as political interest was secured for the British Government. But soon the Khan died, and his son proved too weak to bring about a union between the Khanates for checking the Russian progress. Indeed, all the labours of Sir Alexander Burnes proved of no avail. The Bokharan structure was already beginning to totter by the mere shadows which the Russians were casting from Tashkend.

In 1876 a rebellion broke out in the Khanate of Khokand, and the life of the Russian Ambassador was threatened. To succour friends in distress a Russian army at once quelled the revolt, and

as a natural consequence Khokand was also annexed. It was now the turn of Bokhara to choose its future. One of the causes of the Khokand disturbance was alleged to be a hint from Bokhara; and, finally, a *coup de grâce* was delivered. Noble Bokhara lay at the feet of the Russians. It is of interest to note that not long ago the Russians held the phrase "Endless extension" as an article of faith. The conquest of the three Khanates opened up a new avenue of thought for the Russians. They began to dream of Golden India. General Skoboleff's utterance against the English is worth quoting. "England lays a heavy hand upon her people," he complained. "She reduces them to a state of slavery, so that English trade may profit and English grow rich." By the fall of Bokhara and the conquest of Turcomania Russia's movements in Asia were menacing the peace of India. This question in its myriads of phases has for long remained a problem. For more than fifty years Russian designs upon India have caused anxiety to Britishers. To us Afghans also the danger was of great magnitude. The cause of all the Anglo-Afghan wars can be traced to Russian intrigues, and the cost of these campaigns amounts to about £71,000,000. First of all, Amir Dost Mohamed was incited to clash with the British, and there is evidence to show that secret treaties existed between Russia and Afghanistan which led to the second Afghan War. In recent times the late Amir was also approached regarding a Russian alliance, but he proved deaf to all such solicitations. The Afghans deplore such a great proximity of the Russian frontier to their own: nor have the Khanates forgotten the Kaufmann march.

Why should Russia fetter the Khanates any longer? And why should these regions not have the right of self-determination? Apart from sentiment, political expediency warrants the liberation of Bokhara, Khiva, and Khokand. The great dread of a "Russian march to India" will for ever be removed, and the peacefulness of that great British dependency will be secured. Further, this step will enable Afghanistan and India to come closer together, which in itself cannot fail to produce a beneficial effect on Mid-Asiatic politics. The above review demonstrates that Russian domination in Central Asia for the last two centuries was not based upon national loyalty, and certainly their mode of government cannot be justified. An inauguration of the former liberty of the Khanates has now become a pressing need against all possible attacks on India; and when this point is viewed in relation to the new condition of things in Mesopotamia and Persia the question at once assumes an aspect of Imperial necessity.

IKBAL ALI SHAH.

EDMOND ROSTAND.

THE theory of atavism is affirmed in Rostand, whose literary genius could be traced to his father Eugène, a distinguished writer on political economy, translator of the Latin poetry of Catullus into the French language, and an author of two volumes of poetry: "Poésies simples" and "Sentiers unis." Rostand's uncle Alexis, although a banker by profession, is the author of good books on music.

Edmond Rostand, the greatest French poet, so much spoken of just now by the whole world, was born in Marseilles on April 1st, 1868, and he was born a poet, for *poetæ nascuntur, oratores fiunt*. He was brought up in intelligent and comfortable surroundings, the prevailing atmosphere of which was charity and devotion towards those who are in want and unhappy. Whilst Rostand was still a child his father wrote for his benefit a small poem, in which he enjoined his little son to think of those whose destiny is sad, and to remember that those whose lives are not brightened by a rosy dawn are his brothers, and that in consequence he should go towards poor people and make shine a ray of light over their bent heads, thus to secure God's sweet benediction in return for the blessing He has granted him. From this poetical fragment one can see that the plant of poetry was already rooted in the poet's family, and soon it grew into a splendid tree full of the most fragrant bloom.

Rostand studied at first at Marseilles, and finished his education in Paris. While still a mere lad at the Collège Stanislas, he strung his lyre and produced tunes of contrasting irony and melancholy—one of the principal characteristics of his whole work—in poems called "Musardises," published in the "Revue Bleue." This early attempt was hailed by some critics as the most brilliant *début* since Alfred de Musset published his "Contes d'Espagne."* When the hundredth anniversary of the college was celebrated Rostand wrote a piece of poetry, "La Ballade de l'ancien élève," which is not well known. The first flight of the eagle reached a delicate short story, "Mon la Bruyère," written when he was but a youth of seventeen years; but his first prose work was the "Essais sur le roman sentimental et le roman naturaliste," in which he attacked vigorously Zola's brutal naturalism.

During his studies Rostand wrote poems but no plays. However, in 1877, he penned a one-act piece, and asked Féraudy to read it. The gifted actor admired the work much, and handed it to Jules Claretie, the director of the Comédie Française. Claretie was very enthusiastic, and said it should be played. The final decision, however, depended not on him but on the committee of the actors before which every piece must be read and its destiny decided by ballot. The actors admired not less the merit of the play, and it would have been produced had it not been for the title, "Pierrots," Theodore de Banville, father of pierrots, being not long dead. "We have enough of *pierrots*," said the actor

* Most of these poems became popular, the best known of them being "Petit Bébé."

Got bluntly, who, as dean of the society, spoke first. "There is already 'Baiser' and 'Diner de Pierrot,' and here we have more *pierrots*. There are too many of them, and soon the house of Molière would resemble a baker's establishment." The committee followed the opinion of its dean, and Claretie wrote to the youthful author telling him that he was very sorry "to see disappear the charming bubble in which a rainbow was reflected."

In 1890 Rostand married Rosemonde Gérard, daughter of a hero, the Marshal Gérard. She is an incomparable Egeria, fond of poetry as personified in her husband, and expressed in a volume, "*Les Pipeaux*." He had two sons by her; the eldest, Maurice, is also a poet, whose verses, published in various papers, are sonorous and romantic, whilst his younger brother, Jean, is called Pic de Mirandola, on account of his extraordinary aptitude for science.

Rostand's dramatic career began in 1894, when he wrote a charming Shakespearean piece, "*Les Romanesques*"—for his musical comedy "*Gant Rouge*," written in collaboration with M. Lée, and produced in 1888 at the Cluny Theatre, does not count. The fancy displayed in "*Les Romanesques*" reminds one of the Italian comedies, as well as those of Marivaux; it is full of the poetry of nature, which inspired the author with beautiful descriptions resembling delightful watercolours, as the following fragment shows:

Ce vieux mur, crêté d'herbe, enguirlandé, couvert,
Ici de vigne rouge, ici de lierre vert,
Là de glycine mauve aux longues grappes floches,
Et là de chèvrefeuille, et là d'aristoloches !
Ce vieux mur centenaire et croulant, dont les trous
Laissent pendre au soleil d'étranges cheveux roux,
Qui de petites fleurs charmantes se constelle,
Ce mur sur qui la mousse est d'une épaisseur telle
Qu'il fait à l'humble banc scellé dans sa paroi,
Un dossier de velours comme au trône d'un roi !

After the production of "*Les Romanesques*,"* the keen Parisian critic Sarcey proclaimed Rostand "the second Regnard." This praise, although very flattering, is but meagre when one thinks how superior is Rostand's subsequent work when compared with that of Regnard. Coquelin *ainé's* appreciation was deeper when, in 1894, having been invited by Sarah Bernhardt to hear the reading of "*La Princesse Lointaine*," he said to the young poet: "In my opinion you are destined to become the greatest dramatic poet of the age. I bind myself here and now to accept any play you write—in which there is a part for me—without reading it, to cancel any engagement I may have on hand, and produce your piece." What a lucky country where one finds such connoisseurs of art!

Before Rostand was able to give Coquelin an opportunity to keep his word, "*La Princesse Lointaine*" was produced on April 5th, 1895, by Sarah Bernhardt. The subject of this piece is taken from the life of Melissinde, daughter of Raimond I.; she was

* Which possesses such literary merit that the Boirac prize of 4,000 francs was awarded to its author by the French Academy.

betrothed to the Greek Emperor Manuel, who discarded her in 1162. She then devoted herself to charitable work. Jaufre Rudel was in love with her; he became a crusader for her sake, went to Tripolis, and died at the moment he beheld her. Rostand modernised this old romantic story, and made a beautiful work of it. The piece had but a moderate success in Paris. In London it was a melancholy failure, notwithstanding that there is much that is charming in it, and that the author could say something of importance on the deep problems of life, and express his thoughts and sentiments in a masterly way. The indomitable hero Rudel, the faithful sailors, the audacious guest, the intensity of the moment of action, and a very exquisite reconciliation to the tragic end, remain in one's mind, and may well outweigh lightness and over-refinement of handling.*

In 1897 Rostand wrote "Ode pour la Grèce" and "La Samaritaine," which, although its subject is religious, has not the simplicity of the mystery plays presented five centuries ago. The action of "La Samaritaine" takes place at the Well of Jacob, then at the Gate of Shechem, and depicts the state of soul of a woman who went to the well to draw water, there met Jesus Christ, returned to the town full of enthusiasm, telling everybody about the faith inspired by the Saviour, and making many proselytes for the new religion. It is one of the most extraordinary dramas of conscience.

As the piece, although successful, aroused no deep interest, Rostand, as a truly great artist, doubted himself and hesitated. To begin again! To go forward! To excel himself! Yes, he has done so, for on the morning of December 27th, 1897, the poet awoke in Paris to find himself not only a happy possessor of the red ribbon of the *Légion d'Honneur*, but also world-famous after the dress rehearsal of "Cyrano de Bergerac," produced the next day at the Porte Saint Martin Theatre, Coquelin playing the principal part in it. When this immortal work was performed it raised its author to a place amongst the greatest French dramatists; its success could be compared only with that of Corneille's "Le Cid" in 1639, and Victor Hugo's "Hernani" in 1810. In this play Rostand moved the hearts of humankind by expressing in the most eloquent way his dearest desire to see the soul striving towards nobleness, pride and moral beauty; as he worships loyal and frank bravery and honesty, his lofty ideal helps him to conquer the heart of the

* The following stanza to Linon became very well known on account of its charming daintiness:

Ce léger linon,
Qui vous emmitoufle,
Mais à la façon,
D'un souffle;
Ce linon léger,
Dont la candeur frêle,
A le voltiger,
D'une aile;
Ce léger linon,
Assez diaphane,
Pour qu'un seul rayon,
Le fane

people. He has a particular claim on the French, for, as a critic said, "he has waved the magnificent *panache* of the great nation and has given to the French a work glittering with *esprit gaulois*"; it is the *panache* of the good-hearted and brave Henry IV., as well as that of de Bayard, *le chevalier sans peur et sans reproche*. Since that time Rostand has been not only praised and admired, but also loved, because he himself loved pride and goodness of heart. In "La Samaritaine" the pages are full of compassion and love; and compassion makes "La Princesse Lointaine" come to Tripolis towards Rudel. Great compassion should be felt also for Cyrano, a sublime victim of his ugliness and devotion.

It should be said *en passant* that if Rostand's play is the best the last century has produced, and the cleverest French critics were unanimous in pronouncing it a masterpiece, the poet had deserved his laurels, gaining them leaf by leaf during endless nights of brain-racking efforts, a price that few, if any, would be willing to give or capable of giving for fame; this is so much the more praiseworthy if one bears in mind that Rostand was a gentleman of independent means, using the popular and *grata* expression.

There is nothing new in "Cyrano." The same subject was treated by Corneille in the characters of Matamore and Rodrigue, by Sarron in "Don Japhet," by Victor Hugo in Don César, by Théophile Gautier in "Fracasse." Rostand's purpose was less to produce something new than to utilise that which remains young, fresh and powerful in the old French literary tradition, viz., preciseness and symbolism, for, as he said himself, "one can make our ancestors' footsteps resound even in modern, quiet streets," and he succeeded in doing so admirably. One could qualify Cyrano de Bergerac's success as extraordinary, not only for its artistic value, but from this point of view, that in "Les Romanesques" Rostand has given us a dainty satire upon romances in general, and he who jested at romance succeeded with a romantic triumph. This, however, should not be looked upon as a contradiction in the poet, for he is an enthusiastic believer in romance. He laughs not at that which he thinks great; he sneers only at those who cannot discern between greatness and paltriness. In that regard he reminds one of the father of romance, Sir Walter Scott, who jested at Julia Mannering. Rostand not only believed in romance, but he was also a poet, viz., "a gentleman," say the brothers de Goncourt, playfully but deeply, "who puts a ladder to a star and ascends it playing a fiddle." He understood that true art cannot limit itself to a pure sensation, colour, sound, and the exterior side of things; that the artist-poet, whose aim is reality, will not be satisfied with its apparent, vulgar side, which by no means constitutes its essence; that to understand, to penetrate, to fathom the abyss of the Fathomless and of the Incomprehensible is the greatest satisfaction one can get from poetry; that the beautiful without a background of Infinity, without a vista looking somewhere towards the stars and even beyond them, cannot exist; that the artist, poet, creator, genius is the one whose imagination embraces both worlds, who, of every thought, of every sentiment, of every phenomenon of the exterior world, of every shiver can

bring out symbolically that element; who can unite the small and ephemeral with the great and everlasting in a vision of such agreement as is present in actual beings.*

Cyrano was not older than the French themselves†; he was essentially French, straightforward, precise, brave, haughty with the proud, compassionate with people of humble position, sublimely sacrificing himself for his friends; he was jovial and noble, as careless of peril as d'Artagnan, as sensitive and full of resistance as Aramis; his generous nature, strength, gaiety, and faith was that of a superior man; he was amiable and sympathetic; he was also very independent, for he said:

“ Et que faudrait-il faire? . . .

Chercher un protecteur puissant, prendre un patron,

Et comme un lierre obscur qui circonvient un tronc,

Et s'en fait un tuteur en lui léchant l'écorce,

Grimper par ruse au lieu de s'élever par force?

Non, merci. . . .”

No wonder then that the glory of this great play, in which Rostand gives us, instead of the commonplace, coarse and vulgar heroes of Zola and his followers, swordsmen, indomitable men of the compelling word and the convincing stroke, hot-blooded, honourable, heroic, *les cadets de Gascogne*, made him so famous, not to speak of his gaiety and verve and spirit and lightness and thrilling situations.

In 1900 “*L'Aiglon*” was produced in Paris, and it was considered *le clou* of the World's Fair. Sarah Bernhardt played the principal part, that of the Duc de Reichstadt, son of Napoleon I. and Marie Louise, Archduchess of Austria. This play, and “*Cyrano de Bergerac*,” opened to Rostand the door of the French Academy on May 30th, 1901, where the seat of the Vicomte de Bornier, author of “*La Fille de Roland*,” was given to him, in spite of the fact that few, if any, so young have been admitted to the ranks of that august body. In the speech read on the day of his admission Rostand praised his predecessor, the knight poet, with filial piety.

When the Czar and Czarina visited Chantilly Rostand wrote an ode “*A une Impératrice*,” which proved that he was less gifted in official incantations than in spontaneous flights of the imagination.

In 1902 the poet celebrated Victor Hugo's hundredth anniversary by a poem called “*Un Soir à Hernani*.” The first meetings for the Academical Dictionary inspired him in 1905 with “*Les Mots*,” while in 1909 he wrote “*Bois Sacré*,”—both in verse. Finally in 1910 he produced his most extraordinary dramatic poem, “*Chantecler*.”

If one said that there was not another play in the history of the theatre of any country that so stirred the emotions and excited curiosity as “*Chantecler*” did, there would be no exaggeration in the statement. The announcement of Racine's “*Phèdre*” and

* Maeterlinck.

† Léon Claretie.

Chaplin's "Pucelle" aroused great excitement, but not to such an extent as was the case with Rostand's last piece. The enthusiasm prompted by it was due not only to the poet's great popularity, but also to the peculiar character of the play. The peculiarity lies in this, that instead of men and women clad either in modern attire or in the costumes of past times, Rostand disguised the actors and actresses as birds and animals, which has not been done for two thousand years, since the time of the Greeks.

In "Chantecler" Rostand overthrew the poetical laws of the theatre, and not only did not make those who are in love sing obligatory duets—according to the rule that those who are the most in love ought to sing the best, especially in pieces written in verse—but he also eliminated, so to speak, the presence of man from the stage in order to facilitate the understanding of his great poetical symbol. This indicates clearly that Rostand is a genius, a power opening new roads to humankind. "Chantecler" will undoubtedly constitute a memorable epoch in the history of the theatre, which sooner or later will be reformed according to the idea of the ancient Greeks, who on their stage created synthetic conditions favourable to the dramatic poem; they felt that there is an antinomy in the production of a poem by means of accidental human elements, and that is why their actors wore masks and long flowing clothes, and walked on stilts.

"Chantecler" is one of Rostand's poetical visions which he had while communing with the charms of nature. In that vision he saw not the world, that frightens and stupefies us by its immensity, by its threatening attitude, due to this fact, that it is out of proportion with our forces, but a piece of the world, a corner of it, a familiar farmyard full of simple rustic poetry. Whilst looking at this spot he was struck by a great likeness between the life that was seething there and our own life; similar great aspirations and paltry cares, similar work, squabbles, intrigues, and he gave us a symbol of that vision; he rendered it in a masterly poem in which there is united—as in life—sublime with ridiculous, exalted with petty. The whole must be qualified as a great masterpiece, perhaps the greatest ever written.

As soon as it was announced that in "Chantecler" Rostand had introduced birds there appeared many articles written by ordinary journalists eagerly seeking for sensational news, as well as by ponderous savants, Hellenists, trying to prove that Rostand had taken the idea from Aristophanes' "Birds," or "Frogs," or "Wasps." Some of them consulted Victor Dury,* in whose work they found a reproduction of a bronze, from Castellani's collection, representing a cock, and affirmed that the head of the bird was very much like the head of the French actress playing the part of the Hen-pheasant in "Chantecler." They also imagined that three figures reproduced in the same work from a painting on a vase representing two actors in mantles with masks of cocks' heads, following a flute player, authorised them to believe that Rostand owed his inspiration to Aristophanes. However, all those conjec-

* Histoire de Grèce.

tures and deductions—although very learned—prove nothing, for it is a fact that we do not know anything about the costumes worn by the actors of the ancient Greeks, viz., those of the fifth century B.C., in which Aristophanes flourished, except that which we find in the text of his ancient plays, the pictorial documents of the Greek theatre transmitted to us referring to Menander, who lived long after Aristophanes. Be it as it may, it is certain that the purpose of the ancient Greeks was not to introduce into their theatre realism but fancy, dream, symbol; for, being the most artistic people that ever lived, they understood that realism has nothing to do with art, that it is obnoxious and even destructive to it.

But supposing that Rostand had taken the idea from the Greeks, his merit is not lessened by this; on the contrary, he proved that he had great artistic taste, for he alone, from amongst thousands of dramatists, understood this most important fact—that we are obliged to look to the Greeks for everything that is great in art and literature.

"Chantecler" is not only one of the greatest dramatic poems, as was acknowledged by the keenest Parisian critics, but also the most sincere confession a poet ever wrote. It is the poignant cry of a man who wishes to draw from the depth of his heart all pain and suffering, all thoughts and doubts. It contains all that constitutes man morally. This poem is a combination of the romance of chivalry with the mystery play. It is the final expression of romanticism, and it would be impossible to improve upon it. The new element that was introduced into the theatre by the romantic writers was the addition to the conflict of passions and facts of the expression of sentiments of a general order which were not necessary to the action. This was an intrusion of the poet into drama.*

Rostand's work became famous the world over, not only because of its literary merit, of free fancy, of good humour, of wholesome gaiety; not because his verses are sonorous and fluent, his rhymes easy and varied; nor because of his great dramatic skill, displayed especially in the Gascon play, but on account of his nobleness of thought and sublime inspiration. It is true that here and there one finds passages, and especially certain expressions, which are not written up to the standard of academical correctness—as was the case with many great writers; take for example Dante and his "*Divina Comedia*"—but there is nothing low and degrading. Even his irony, although biting, is merry. In Rostand's work we find a beautiful Christian *Sursum corda*, as the following lines from "*La Princesse Loïntaine*" show:

"Tout rayon qui filtre d'idéal,
Est autant de gagné dans l'âme sur le mal.
Je vois dans tout but noble un but plus noble poindre;
Car lorsqu'on eut un rêve on n'en prends pas un moindre.

Oui, je suis partisan des aventures hautes:
Et près de celles-ci, que sont les Argonautes?

* Léon Blum.

Ah ! l'inertie est seul vice, maître Erasme !
 Et la seul vertue, c'est . . .
 . . . L'enthousiasme ! ”

From everything that Rostand has written there seems to blow a generous breeze of enthusiasm, of faith, and of devotion. Every character has his ideal. The Duc de Reichstadt, “L'Aiglon,” is devoted to his father's great shadow ; he dreams of heroic deeds when he cries : “ Oh ! vouloir à l'histoire ajouter des chapitres !

Cyrano sacrifices himself for love and friendship ; he dies defying cowardice and falsehood :

“ Oui, vous m'arracherez tout, le laurier et la rose !
 Que j'emporte, et ce soir, quand j'entrerai chez Dieu,
 Mon salut balaiera le seul bleu,
 Quelque chose que sans un pli, sans une tache,
 J'emporte malgré vous. ”

There is nothing more exalted than the Samaritan woman's faith, while Rudel is not only an enthusiastic Christian—a crusader—but also a poet pursuing his ideal over land and sea, mountains and valleys, and giving for it his life. The same enthusiasm, the same faith, the same hymn to the beautiful, the same hearty Hallelujah of hope, the same *panache blanc* of chivalry we find in all his work.

Rostand in his plays gives us great dramatic moments that will remain, that are permanent and complete in themselves ; that is to say, final, as is Hamlet when he says, “ The rest is silence. ”

SOISSONS.

THE DEMOBILISATION OF JUVENILE WORKERS.

" Unless those most competent to judge are mistaken, in the generation which entered industry between 1914 and 1918 vitality has been lowered, morale undermined, and training neglected. . . . For these years numbers of young persons have been exposed to almost every influence which could impair health, undermine character, and unfit them, both in body and mind, for regular study or intelligent citizenship. . . . Our task now is to arrest the process of deterioration, and to ensure that the mischief which has been done in the stress of re-organisation for war shall not be perpetuated or aggravated in the stress of re-organisation for peace. The centre of the problem is the period of economic transition which will accompany the conclusion of hostilities. It will be at once a peril and an opportunity."—Report on Juvenile Employment during the War and After: issued by the Ministry of Reconstruction, 1918, pp. 52, 69.

I.—THE PERIL.

THE social problems and difficulties that have become prominent during the war are not all new, nor are they caused by the war, but they have become intensified, more acute, and more evident by reason of the war. In regard to young people in industry, for instance, the problem is the same old problem that came in with machinery—even perhaps before it—the problem of the decay of apprenticeship. There are two kinds of occupation for young people, in one of which regard is chiefly had to the future. The boy or girl is regarded as a learner, does not receive high wages, but becomes trained so as to take a better place in the industrial world later on. In the other kind of occupation the young worker is employed merely for present purposes and with little or no regard to his future, earning higher wages than the learner, but at work of a temporary character with no pretence even of being educative. Ever since the industrial revolution the latter type of work has tended to increase and the former to decrease. Production is now carried on mostly on a very large scale and for a world-wide market. Production on these lines can be carried on most effectively through subdivision of processes and the substitution of machine work for hand. The factory tends to supersede the home and the small workshop, the less skilled worker to replace the fully trained. It is quite true that when this process has been pushed far enough we reach a further stage and a much more hopeful one; the machines themselves become complex and delicate, the handling thereof demands a new kind of skill of a very high order, and they are tended and kept in order by mechanics whose technical qualifications and general knowledge and intelligence are different in kind from but certainly not inferior in degree to those of the old craftsman. But industry has not yet developed so far, or not to any great extent. It is, indeed, held back in its evolution by the abundance (in normal times) of cheap or comparatively cheap labour which can be turned to profitable uses, and thus defers the day when the super-

machine will be used for general purposes. The characteristic development of these times is the production of enormous numbers of standardised articles through subdivision of processes and repetition work. Many of the operations performed in factories can be picked up in a very short time, while, on the other hand, the occupations that demand a prolonged period of training are diminishing in number. Mr. Arnold Freeman, writing shortly before the war, estimated that less than one-fourth of the manual labour of Birmingham could be called skilled.* And Mr. Bray wrote in 1911: "That the boy of to-day is the workman of to-morrow is a thought that suggests itself to only a few of the most enlightened employers. To the many he is merely a cheap instrument of production to be used up and then scrapped as waste machinery."† If industry is thus, under modern conditions and through no fault of the manual workers themselves, losing its educational function, what is to take its place? What is being done, outside industry, to train up the younger generation in the habits and ideals that make the good workman and the good citizen? Here there is practical unanimity among those who have given their best thought to the matter; the position is extraordinarily bad. Evening schools, technical institutes, and other places of higher education have been successful in regard to those who come within their sphere of influence, but that sphere is as yet most regrettably small. "Nowhere on a large scale can we discover provision made for the supervision and training of juveniles."‡ In the case of girls the lack of purely industrial training may be perhaps less observable, because a large proportion of young women pass out of industry when they marry, but the lack of training for the character and intelligence, it may be suggested, is even more regrettable in their case. During the war the position of juveniles has undoubtedly become definitely worse. The effect of war has been to quicken the tendency already in operation towards degrading the qualifications and lowering the educational standards which had with difficulty survived the disintegrating forces of machine industry. All considerations of future requirements were put aside and subordinated to increase of output. The result has been that industry has become less educative than ever; the proportion of learners to labourers among young people has greatly diminished. Mechanical work of a relatively unskilled kind offered such high wages that it would be absurd to expect the boys and girls themselves not to be tempted; and, on the other hand, employers were even less willing than usual (save in exceptional cases) to arrange for training, and this again is not surprising; the immense rush and pressure of the war, the mixed motives, the appeal of patriotism combined with the temptation of rapid gains, carried all before them. Machinery was increased in quantity and speeded up in working. The output per machine and per worker was enormously increased, and the immediate object was, happily for us all, attained. But there is another side. Not

* *Boy Life and Labour*, p. 165.

† *Boy Labour and Apprenticeship*, p. 168.

‡ Bray, *op. cit.* p. 167.

only has the problem of industrial training become more acute, but there is evidence that young workers have suffered a considerable degree of overwork and exhaustion, and that the conditions have tended in an unusual degree to be not merely uneducative but positively demoralising. The two phenomena are probably closely allied. The writer of the Report quoted at the head of this paper says, with a rather grim irony, that a strain has been put upon the character of young persons between 14 and 18 "which might have corrupted the integrity of Washington and have undermined the energy of Samuel Smiles. Many of them have suffered physically from the strain of long hours and exhausting work. Many of them have left school prematurely. Some have become in the absence of their fathers the chief wage-earner of the family." A correspondent from Rochdale reports that the most serious effects upon health are found among boys of 15 and 16 who are given work normally done by men. The higher wages induce the boys to work hard, but they often find the strain too heavy. Not infrequently in normal times boys and girls are unable to stand cotton mill conditions, and after a trial have to give it up, while many others struggle on to the detriment of their health. "This state of things has grown worse."* Miss Collier writes that in Birmingham and Coventry, in 1916, girls of 16 and upwards were expected in most cases to take their turn at night work with older workers, and that any attempt to suit the work to the needs and physical capacity of adolescents was so rare that the few cases where such provision was made "stand out in marked contrast." In the cotton industry the position is even worse, for girls exempted from school attendance, which may be at 13 years old, work the full factory day and are no more considered than adults.† In the case of girls under 18 temporarily employed in Government offices during the war a recent inquiry showed that only about one-fourth were attending classes, and in some offices the hours were so long as to make it impossible the girls should do so.‡

Such conditions, one is tempted to say, are inhuman. Does even the emergency of war justify such reckless disregard of the future? Is it not the case that the same output, or perhaps a greater output, could have been secured by employment for reasonable hours? Is not the real fact this, that no tradition of effective thought and care for adolescent workers has ever formed part of our industrial policy? When the emergency came it was easier to increase the burden already resting upon youthful shoulders than to think out methods less wasteful of life and character. But there can be no doubt that a heavy price will have to be paid for this kind of vicarious patriotism. It is a melancholy but not surprising fact that indictable offences by children and young persons increased—and, indeed, increased rather heavily—during the years of war. This is not the romantic side of war, but perhaps it is well for us to remember that part of the sacrifice consisted in—the lapse of children into crime.

* *Report to Ministry of Reconstruction*, p. 33 n.

† *The Girl in Industry*, pp. 37-38.

‡ *Report to Ministry of Reconstruction*, Appendix H.

Following all the industrial confusions of war, we are now confronted with the possibility of widespread unemployment of young persons. Here again we have to remember that this phenomenon, like others noted above, is not merely an effect of the war, but is a feature of adolescent occupations. Displacement of boys and girls occurs largely at the age of about 17, because, working in a "blind alley" occupation as so many do, they reach the age when they are discharged to make room for a fresh supply of juvenile workers. It is not the fault of the seventeen-year-olds; industry happens to be organised on that basis. In the present juncture the position will be much more acute than usual through the demobilisation of soldiers and men recently employed on war industries. It is anticipated that the discharges of girls will be much more numerous even than those of boys, the girls having been more largely employed on work which will now be discontinued, and under agreements with the trade unions which provide for the reinstatement of male labour where it has been temporarily dispensed with.

II.—THE OPPORTUNITY.

Bringing together the salient points in this brief *aperçu* of a complicated subject, we can see that the situation, difficult as it is, is not without hope. We have to face the results of our own and our forebears' folly; but, if we do so, we have just now an exceptionally favourable opportunity for correction and amendment. We may set out the position in prosaic businesslike fashion as follows:—

On the debit side we have a great loss of juvenile ability and capacity through over-fatigue, lack of training, and demoralising conditions in the past four years; and the prospect of further waste and demoralisation through unemployment. On the credit side, we have the patent fact that the demobilisation and consequent lack of employment which must occur at least temporarily among adults is an excellent moment for holding back the employment of the young. Practically every working-class family, every little group of friends and acquaintances, will see some of their men-folk coming from France or from the munition factory, and trying to make their way into their old jobs again. No better object-lesson could be imagined on the false economy of pushing juveniles into competition with their fathers and elder brothers.

Another consideration occurs here. At the present time, when all but the hopelessly callous and selfish must feel the enormous debt owed by the elder to the younger, surely there is some hope of a new social outlook in regard to the problem of youth. A recent writer has told us in words that are severe but not exaggerated, that modern civilisation is no civilisation at all; "it is a material condition which has usurped a spiritual title."* We need a change of heart, and something more: we need to replace the dominant conception of the juvenile as wage-earner by the new conception of the juvenile as the potential workman, the "citizen in training." There is evidence that such a change of outlook is in some directions beginning to

* *Nation*, January 4th, 1919, p. 400.

make itself felt. In some of the more progressive cities and towns the choice of employment for boys and girls leaving school is considered by the After-Care Committee with the conscious and deliberate aim of finding the child not only "suitable" (a dangerous word!), but beneficial employment. And, although the feeling is now general that apprenticeship of the old type is all but gone, attempts are being made to recast the institution and bring it into harmony with modern needs, as, for instance, by a shorter period of apprenticeship, a fairer scale of wages, and by placing on the master the responsibility of seeing that the apprentice is employed under healthy conditions and attends school for certain hours. These children, however, are a favoured few. But even in factory work of the more monotonous and unskilled kinds, in which apprenticeship is obviously impossible, employment committees are beginning to urge the importance of teaching more than one process of the work, and of requiring boys and girls doing specially uneducative work of this kind to attend continuation classes so as to protect their minds against its deadening influence. All this is valuable and paves the way for the coming into force of the Fisher Act.

It is, however, the problem of the unemployed juvenile that will cry aloud for solution. One reform, greatly needed on other grounds, would be an amendment to the Factory Act shortening the hours of labour of juveniles. Another helpful measure would be to keep back the children now at school from forcing their way into the labour market and still further aggravating the problem. But what seems to be chiefly needed is some definite organised provision of "maintenance with training," as advocated by the Minority Report of the Poor Law Commission, 1909. Such a scheme should be conceived on elastic lines and worked in co-operation with voluntary societies, because there is at present no great volume of experience to guide us in administering such schemes. But the administration cannot be left to voluntary societies alone, for the simple reason that they are not equal to dealing with the juvenile problem. The work that is done is excellent, but the organisation is not nearly adequate for the work that needs doing. What is needed is in every industrial centre some effective provision for turning to good account the idle time of young persons thrown out of work. Such a suspension of factory work need not be an unmitigated misfortune, it might even be regarded as a "blessing in disguise." It is an opportunity according to circumstances for resting the fatigued, teaching the ignorant, exercising muscles cramped by monotonous movements, recreating the fagged and weary. It is a chance for giving these young ones an outlook into a larger and finer world of ideas. Efforts have already been made in London and in Birmingham to start centres for unemployed boys and girls. Technical engineering training, also classes in cooking, physical drill, singing, fancy work, have been found both useful and attractive, but as yet the machinery is not nearly sufficient to deal with the numbers who are expected to be shortly out of work. No hard and fast curriculum need be imposed; the present is

eminently an opportunity for trying experiments, experiments in arts and crafts, in self-governing societies, camping, domestic training, household-orderly training, clubs of all sorts (indefinitely more clubs are needed), or, in the case of children with more brains than the average, tuition courses on the W.E.A. model. The basis of the scheme would, of course, remain the regular attendance of the unemployed juvenile as a condition of receiving out-of-work pay.

It is said, probably with truth, that there will be great difficulty in turning back the emancipated youth of 14 or 15 into the position of a pupil. It is, I fear, the case that the elementary instruction given to young boys and girls tends in the last years of school attendance to become dull and uninspiring: there is a loss of interest, the adolescent has not so far been much considered, and, as the older children imagine, "there is nothing more for them to learn"! But surely this difficulty might be overcome by giving a greater variety of teaching at the proposed centres and by emphasising the recreational aspect. There is a deplorable lack of means of recreation, especially of healthy games in the open air, for children of the working class—*viz.*, the great majority. We need to recognise that open-air games and other healthy forms of recreation are needed by all young people, and not merely by a select few in the more favoured classes. It is gratifying to know that the need has been recognised in Clause 17 of the Education Act.

A considerable difficulty in organising the training centres that are needed must be, of course, the lack of staff. The war has for four and a half years monopolised a large share of the best and ablest social workers of both sexes, and many of them will not yet be set free. But we may hope that a stream will from now onwards be flowing back from the Army in France. Some of the needed workers might be found in that great reserve of possible working power, the normally unoccupied girls, many of whom have for the first time found work during the war and will be reluctant to go back to an aimless, futile life of doing nothing.

In conclusion, we must note the plea made in the Report to the Ministry of Reconstruction (already quoted) for a more carefully-thought-out policy and better co-ordination among different bodies. Measures need to be prepared in concert among the Labour Exchange authorities, the Education authorities, the school medical officers, employers, and trade unions; otherwise a good deal of waste and friction is sure to occur. There is also needed some central representative body which should be able to survey the whole subject of juvenile unemployment, consider its bearings on apprenticeship, casual labour, and education (both technical and general), and prepare a remedial and constructive policy. Such a scheme no doubt might and would cost money. But, wisely administered, it would save much of the present deplorable waste of young life and ability, which also, it may be remarked, costs money as well as much besides. One correspondent writes to me that it is now impossible to undo the harm that has been done to adolescents during the war. The great matter is to prevent such injury in the future.

B. L. HUTCHINS.

SHOULD GOVERNMENT CONTINUE TO CONTROL INDUSTRY AFTER THE WAR?

THE function of Government is to ensure the welfare of its subjects as members of a community. War expands and amplifies this function by including protection of the community and the defence of its territories from hostile invasion or menace. But this entails a reorganisation of the sources of production, so that an adequate output of munitions, clothing and food may be continuously available for the forces in the field by land, sea and air, and it is the duty of a War Cabinet to find the equation between this vital function and the maintenance of a supply of the bare necessities of life for the civil population, so as to leave unimpaired the efficiency of the nation. Upon the solution of this problem depends success in a war where the forces are as evenly balanced as in the present struggle. Hence follows Government Control of such industries as are vitally concerned in the conduct of the war; and a concomitant control of non-essential industries, so that the productive forces of the nation may not be dissipated in the output of unnecessary articles.

The exigencies of war have suspended the manufacture of useless articles, and it is unthinkable that we should return to the old "laissez faire" policy which wasted energy and squandered the resources of the country in occupations or in the production of articles which were frequently harmful, and at best of no benefit whatever to the community as a whole or even to those who were responsible for their creation. It has equally encouraged the development of key industries, which had been allowed to drift into the hands of the Central Powers, thus imperilling the very existence of our national commonwealth.

The clamant needs of the army necessitated the institution of a system of priority, so that the output of the munitions most urgently needed by the Commander-in-Chief might be accelerated and that of the less essential retarded or stopped. This necessitated the control of raw materials, steel, copper, spelter, platinum, aluminium, timber, coal, petrol, oils, cotton, wool, flax, jute, hemp and other textiles. Thus gradually the needs of the field encroached on the whole gamut of raw materials.

The allocation of these supplies necessitates controlling manufacture so that machine tools, explosives, shells, motor transport, aeroplanes, guns, small arms and their ammunition, shipbuilding and textiles all come under control. Little by little important industries have been taken over, as "controlled firms," and their oversea supply of raw materials rationed. The degree of control varies considerably. Cotton, for example, the best organised trade, has since June, 1917, been regulated by the Cotton Control Board appointed by the Board of Trade, and consisting of eighteen representatives, an equal number being selected from employers' associations and from workpeople's organisations, together with a small number of representatives of other interests concerned, and with one official on the Board.

In this manner the State has practically assumed the monopoly of industrial output and by the issue of complicated regulations it has unavoidably hampered the conduct of trade and industry. Unfortunately the official attitude towards trade is not beneficent; it tends to check individual initiative and discourages consultation and

co-operation with the men engaged in industry, no doubt on the grounds that self-interest will dominate the conduct of these men. The loss of individual initiative when this has been superseded by State control can be shown to have been detrimental to progress all along the line; yet State control can be converted into a useful means of co-ordination of effort, if it be so designed that individual effort is guided but not stifled. Sudden changes are never good, and it is certain that the transition from the extreme individualism before the war to the tight control during the war has endangered the best feature of the former. The transition from the extreme control of the war to after-war conditions should endeavour to preserve the best in both systems, although the popular voice is likely to clamour for a complete withdrawal of the control. Vexatious regulations and exorbitant taxation, totalling 85-90 per cent. (on so-called excess profits) act as a deterrent and tend to destroy enterprise. Merchants finding stocks commandeered at artificially low prices are discouraged from enterprise and deprived of incentive. To embark capital in the importation of material from distant markets, at the inflated prices ruling in war times, promises doubtful remuneration and spells considerable risk. Shortages ensue and, as an example, the mills in a certain town are obliged to close down for a fortnight owing to lack of raw material. A general apathy threatens the community, and industrialists lose their "snap" and vigour. We begin to lose sight of those strong assertive men, who unaided in the face of supreme difficulties achieved success in free competition against the whole world. The pendulum has swung and may have reached the elysium of Socialists.

The State holds industry within her grip. Conscious of the supreme aim which our rulers have in view, the country submits to this ever-tightening control, but secretly longs to loosen the shackles, so as to free individuals for the untrammelled exercise of their talents and energies. But we have rung out the old and must ring in the new. A higher order is about to supervene. The situation is full of possibilities, and pregnant with promise, if we fathom its mysteries and learn its lessons. To order our movements so as to evolve healthy conditions upon which we can frame a new structure is a problem which will tax our judgment to the utmost.

Which are the points we must keep before us? In a world without war, where trade may be carried on under natural conditions of free barter and exchange, the law of supply and demand suffices to regulate production, but a state of war precludes this and sets aside the workings of natural laws, imposing upon us artificial barriers and restrictions which divert industry and commerce from old channels and interfere with the normal course of trade. War exposes shams and incidentally reveals the secret machinations which have caused certain foreign industries to capture and monopolise key industries, for the peace of pre-war days was static war. Germany was secretly encouraging trade at the expense of that of friendly nations, by a series of bounties, drawbacks, subsidies, and rebates on maritime and land freights; by tariffs and such measures unknown to the victims as impede or prevent natural conditions of trade.

No nation can in future afford to remain blind to these aggressive tactics which attack the trade of foreign states in order to profit

thereby. However clever the individual in inventive genius or in capacity to organise, however well supplied with capital and skilled labour he may be, if such an insidious attack from without is being made upon his industry, he must sooner or later succumb. Association into a "cartel" or trust or into other industrial groups may stave off the evil day, but unless the State is prepared to counter the actions of this enemy power, we shall gradually find our wealth transferred to foreign coffers. Government can only assume its most important function, that of assuring that there shall be prosperity in the land, by acting *in unison* with the industrial and mercantile forces of the nation both at home and abroad, so as to stem the tide of foreign aggression.

The duty of our consular and diplomatic services is to collaborate with the mercantile community at home and abroad so as to keep the trades informed as to the trade regulations of foreign competing countries and to advise them of such changes therein as are likely to jeopardise British interests, so that Government, in consultation with the trades affected, may take opportune action. The Board of Trade has already created machinery for strengthening the Trade Intelligence Department by a closer co-operation between consular and mercantile services, and this is a step in the right direction.

Prosperity can only be fostered (a) *by directing the energies of the nation into right channels*, (b) *by amicable and thoughtful co-operation between labour and capital so as to ensure the maximum output of articles which our country is most suited to manufacture*, (c) *by the creation of foreign markets to absorb surplus production not required for home consumption*. Never in the history of the Nation has there been a greater necessity for a wise dispensation to encourage industry, stimulate output, and inspire the need of thrift in the heart of the people. The heavy burden of the war has already lowered the value of currency by one-half, and the equilibrium can only be re-established by thrift and output. The old shibboleths of Protection and Free Trade must pass away, and we should replace these dry phrases with an intelligent policy framed to make the most of our vast resources and boundless energy. A scientific analysis of the active forces of the country should help us to solve the problem which, briefly stated, consists of increasing our agricultural and industrial production sufficiently to amortise rapidly the colossal burden of our £7,000,000,000 indebtedness. We have the resources, we have the energy, and we have the brains. All we ask of Government is to relieve us of the irksome burden of such official control of detail as has gradually been forced upon trade since the war started. The fundamental conception of Government control must no longer be considered as satisfied by placing in supreme authority officials who are ignorant of trade, and by leaving them to flounder in the maze of trade technicalities with which they cannot reasonably be expected to become conversant.

The Nation is seeking to find its feet. Vast hidden forces are at work in mine and workshop. Men and women are striving for equilibrium. The old order changeth, and amidst the clash of arms and the din of battle we do not always discern the end we have in view. But out of this chaos order will come, and future prosperity depends on a wise marshalling of the forces of labour and capital in friendly association. A better spirit must exist. The

Whitley Report has given a lead, and if its recommendations are earnestly followed we can hope for better conditions.

Co-partnership is proving a happy means of encouraging unity of purpose amongst employers and workpeople. Without this we cannot hope for industrial peace and whole-hearted co-operation in the production under ideal conditions of a maximum quantity of well-made articles. As long as the interests of capitalist and workman are divided and looked upon as purely antagonistic we can never bridge the gulf between them. The adjustment of its relationship will exact extreme tact and patience, and many failures may be looked for before we reach the goal. There are signs of an industrial struggle at the termination of the war, but this should be averted at all costs, as a house divided against itself cannot stand, and Britain will never have had so great a need of standing as solidly together in the coming peace as in battle before the foe.

Scarcity of food and raw materials will continue long after the war ceases, and may even be accentuated by the removal of the blockade, so that rationing must persist until increased production and sufficient ocean freights permit relief. An accurate table of allied resources is requisite. The Inter-allied Council will undoubtedly have to continue its function of allocation of freights and supplies for years to come, and the Empire must be considered as one problem. Any accurate forecast of the industrial requirements of raw materials under the altered conditions is precluded. This renders exceedingly difficult the task which must be faced in gauging national needs of raw materials, yet the success of industry hangs on reliable statistics.

Such rationing implies closer correspondence between the Government and the industrial world, and emphasises the necessity of industry being associated, so that the Secretary of one Committee may be the mouthpiece of each section of industry. Each industry must be represented by both capital and labour in a National Industrial Council, whose function will be the regulation of industry and control of output, according to the exigencies of trade and sound requirements. The Association of each represented industry must be given power to direct any decrease in production so as to meet the needs of reduced demand or diminished supplies of raw materials, and to regulate wages so that no stoppage of production may be thought necessary to enforce rises of wages. Each industry and trade must maintain accurate charts and statistics of supplies and prices of raw materials. A note of stocks of manufactured articles and a list of orders actually in hand must be collated so that production may be controlled scientifically instead of by the present haphazard system. There is a close correlation in the fluctuations of the prices of all commodities, which if understood would enormously facilitate the solution of that difficult problem, *i.e.*, the intelligent anticipation of future wants, upon which depends the marring or making of success in industry and commerce. Trade Committees must supply to the Board of Trade or to the Ministry of Industry and Commerce exact data for statistical purposes and must prepare for submission to the Industrial Council, and eventually to Parliament, any scheme which is deemed necessary for remedying some defect in industrial organisation, for coping with threatened attack by a foreign competitive power, or the necessity for a revision of wages or alteration in output.

A scientifically organised industrial nation should experience little difficulty in framing wise legislation to meet every emergency; but such legislation must not emanate from unskilled politicians who are out of touch with the needs of industry, few of whom are conversant with trade requirements and most of whom favour their own constituencies. This vicious system disappears where an Industrial Council becomes the advisory body in all industrial matters, and thus science replaces guess-work. Extreme fluctuations of wages are, in large part, due to badly directed production, now excessive, now deficient; this bad direction is due to faulty or neglected statistics. The Industrial Council supplies an antidote to this, and thus contributes to industrial peace. Wages must not oscillate so widely as in the past, and ways and means of stabilising them must be found.

There are two methods of reducing production pending readjustment: the one a ruthless dismissal of a percentage of the workpeople, which means the weeding out of the less fit, who, it follows, are less capable of finding fresh employment. The second method entails universal reduction of hours for the whole trade. This may bring wages below the living point, and obviously it is the duty of the State to ease the shock of any sudden dislocation of industrial conditions. Pending a readjustment of industrial output to peace conditions it might be prudent to ear-mark a quota of the excess profits tax for the balancing of wages in those industries which, having been most upset by the turnover from war work, have had to reduce the weekly hours so that the workpeople cannot earn a living wage.

Many concerns have scrapped antiquated machinery and old methods, and have reconstructed plant and reorganised so that they are in a position to meet the severest foreign competition. Unquestionably a similar transformation has taken place amongst our allies. New industries have been established in France, Italy, and other Continental countries and in the United States. These may prove formidable competitors in certain lines which were once the speciality of British enterprise. Scarcity of certain supplies has enforced the use of substitutes, which will be continued after conditions become normal. Guided by the permanent Industrial Council a tight control of industrial output must be enforced, so that the best use may be made of the raw material put at our disposal. Scarcity will oblige us to husband our resources for years after the war, and the benefits derived from thrift should be such that reactionaries will scarcely dare to attempt a reversion to the loose ways of the pre-war period.

Until such time as the construction of ships shall replace war losses, freights must remain abnormally scarce and dear, and it will be necessary to retain the national control of shipping as also the allocation of freight space, so that essential articles may obtain priority. The whole transport problem must be carefully studied and remodelled. Britain has suffered severely in the past through the excessive railway rates charged on goods, which have placed a substantial premium on merchandise imported by sea from Belgium, Germany, and elsewhere. Our inland waterways must be developed and used to their utmost capacity, and up-to-date electrical traction installed as in Belgium, to drive the barges not fitted

with motors. Railway rates must be revised downwards, and a well co-ordinated transport service by rail, motor, barge and coast steamer be devised with a tariff on the zone principle which led to such good results in Hungary. The Arnold scheme of uniform rates and the Gatti system of discharge and distribution of goods are worthy of a trial. Instead of Government control of these services, let the respective Boards get together and work out a scheme for unity of direction. Government control of railways has not been conspicuously successful in France, and we can rather trust the men who are born and bred in the transport business to improve the service so as to meet the strain which expanding national industry and the new conditions of life will put upon it.

Restraint of trade, and change of direction on the flow of exports to meet the exigencies of war, have brought about artificial conditions which have obliged the Government to regulate exchange by other than natural means. Until a restoration of commerce to its normal condition the control of exchange must therefore be maintained by the Allies, nor can we anticipate a resumption of the laws of supply and demand as a regulating factor until production arrives at a point which will enable us to balance imports with exports. The world has never before talked in thousands of millions sterling, so that past experience in the readjustment of an exchange disturbed by a local war cannot serve as a precedent, nor give us any inkling of the course of financial events before us. A redistribution of wealth has taken place which shakes the pillars of society, and leaves the world fundamentally changed. The spending power of the masses has vastly increased, and it is unlikely that we can count upon so large a volume of exports from a similar production, since more will be consumed in home markets. This will retard the rehabilitation of exchange. Against this we may set the increased production of foodstuffs on the new area under cultivation in farms and allotments; also the production of sundry articles at home which we formerly obtained from abroad. We cannot afford to increase imports to cater for the new wants of an enriched population, but their effort must be stimulated to supply the deficiency by increased output at home.

The activity of the U boats, nefarious though it has been, may not prove an unmixed evil. We have been prone to neglect home resources, and have relied too exclusively on the importation of articles from overseas. The Restriction of Imports Department of the Board of Trade, whose valuable work has been little noticed, must continue to operate so that a healthy control may be placed on importation. The list of articles whose importation is prohibited except under licence may have to be retained for some time and a few other articles may have to be placed under permanent control. This Department should be in continual touch with a Technical Committee of the Industrial Council, consulting as to the manufacture of articles which importers claim must be brought from abroad, but which it is judged can be made at home.

An Industrial Research Committee, composed of technical men from different branches, should be accorded executive discretionary powers to encourage or advise as to the class of article which certain industrial groups should manufacture. The Trade Intelligence Department could co-operate by furnishing the requisite information

as to the methods employed in the manufacture of the article in the country of its origin. War has taught us the lesson of co-operation and a steady interchange of technical advice on intricate problems of manufacture of explosives, chemicals, munitions, etc., has been taking place among the Allies, which betokens well for the advancement of civilisation in the League of Free Nations which will emerge from the world conflict.

War is the fire of hell which burns up the spent and useless matter in both the material and the spiritual planes and purifies the residuum. Those who contemplate a reconstruction of society and industry on the old lines are blind to the lessons of history. Never has the world seen such a conflict, because never was there such an accumulation of débris and waste products to clear up. Autocracy is not the only institution which will go by the board in this mammoth struggle. All that autocracy, feudalism, and the evils of individualism bore in their train is being broken down by the high explosives which alas! have sent so many of our sons and brothers into the other world. Genius has not been more conspicuous in the conduct of the war than it is likely to prove in the Reconstruction problem. Rapid mobilisation of industrial output and men, organisation of commissariat and of transport, all on a scale unheard of in history, have placed at the disposal of the Commander-in-Chief such vast numbers of men and such an accumulation of resources that no one brain can manœuvre as in the wars of old. The solution of the Reconstruction problem will equally absorb the energies of the nation for many decades, and victory will belong to no outstanding genius, but to the whole plodding group of free peoples all intent on evolving order out of chaos.

It is the fashion to belittle the efforts of the past century, but to speak disrespectfully of the institutions which helped Britain to attain the premier position in industry and commerce indicates a complete misunderstanding of the teaching of past history. Let us imitate the self-reliance and perseverance and resourcefulness of those men who, unaided, built up our splendid engineering, textile, and shipbuilding industries. Let us encourage the men who will step into their shoes, to develop just such qualities. Let us strengthen what was weak and cut off what proved a barrier to national prosperity. Instead of casting envious eyes at the progress of other nations, who had learnt the lesson of association and had organised accordingly, let us cast aside the insular prejudice which holds men aloof and prevents that close human co-operation without which efforts become stilted and barren. Let him who dreads to meet a competitor for fear of giving away a trade secret, remember that only by an interchange of ideas and by the general application of the most up-to-date methods can British manufacturers hope to hold their own in the world competition which will ensue when peace is declared.

The war has brought the nations together, and they have profited by closer association. It is unthinkable that in peace time they should forget the lesson and revert to the old order. If Britain is to assume the leading place in the League of Free Nations she must organise from within and be able to direct her splendid energies so that there may be happiness in the home and prosperity in the land.

In conclusion, the industrial effort of the country must be co-

ordinated. Isolation, however splendid, can no longer stand before the organised forces of other countries. The Banks have thought fit to amalgamate, so as to present a solid front to the consolidation of banking interests which Germany recently brought about.* The banker has been master in his own home, and has carried through this reform without Government assistance—one may even say in spite of official discouragement. Let maritime and land transport and industrial concerns speedily follow suit, for we have passed through the individualist stage of production and are now entering the "Associative phase" predicted early last century by Charles Fourier, who indicated that this fourth phase in the world's development is but a stepping-stone to a still higher order of organisation, "where each shall be interested in the success of all the rest and in which the whole body undertakes only those branches of cultivation and manufacture for the products of which there is a sure demand." "The industrious classes of the combined order," he adds, "will then enjoy to the full extent the seven natural rights of man." This should be our aim and endeavour, and it is the answer to the question put in the title of this article.

ALFRED WIGGLESWORTH.

* Sir Edward Holden, in a recent masterly address to the shareholders of the London, City and Midland Bank, Ltd., gave the following comparison of the deposits of the five principal banks in Britain and Germany:

GERMANY.

Bank.	Deposits.
Deutsche	£450,000,000
Discont Gesellschaft ...	300,000,000
Dresdner	220,000,000
Bank für Handel und Industrie	90,000,000
Commerz und Discont ...	80,000,000
	<hr/>
	£1,140,000,000

UNITED KINGDOM.

Bank.	Deposits.
London, City and Midland Limited	£314,000,000
Lloyds	300,000,000
London County and Westminster and Parrs ...	250,000,000
Barclays	220,000,000
National Provincial and Union of England ...	180,000,000
	<hr/>
	£1,264,000,000

A STRANGE NEW WORLD.

WE are often told that the coming generation will enter upon a new state of being, perhaps a new world. But "the goodly fellowship of the prophets" are more agreed upon the social novelty of these conditions than upon any precise definition of them. There will undoubtedly be greater opportunities for the human race involving fresh problems. The terrible pressure of war has quickened invention, started us upon new lines of thought, and stimulated enterprise. War upon such an appalling scale has summoned recruits from every part of the earth, haunted every sea, and laid every continent under contribution. The Asiatic and African races now understand the meaning of modern war, and consciously acknowledge the fighting supremacy of the European. One outstanding fact is the increased rapidity of travel across sea and land which the aircraft of the future will further extend, multiplied and perfected as it is certain to be. There are intimate suggestions of travel and of trade in the wireless messages, and in the variety of airship, and of plane. These will tend to make the whole world kin. But this kinship will require to be organised in order that it may not degenerate into family quarrels. In one respect an increasing knowledge of each other may deepen the notes of difference between the three large groupings of the human family. To ignore these differences is not to secure unity. A recognition of them can best be interpreted by the convention "to live and to let live."

The whole problem of race has not yet been probed. It is possible that the roots of nationality strike deep into primal divergencies which we will not here discuss. But we shall know the facts of life for the first time. No veil of mystery will hide from us the most remote corner of the earth. Gone are the days of Livingstone and of Stanley. There will no longer be the tedious research, the careful preparation, the slow caravan, the years of patient discovery. The pygmies of the forest or the fabled monsters of some yet untrodden paths in the deepest recesses of a continent—all these will have become as familiar as the Esquimaux, or the South Sea Islander, the reindeer, or the camel. If it be again reported that a specimen of the giant sloth has been found alive in the heart of Patagonia, we shall not be dependent upon the stories of Indians who claim to have slain the brute, and to have brought its bloody bones and skin down to the coast as evidence. An adventurous airman will either confirm the story, or dismiss it to the Tertiary period. A fleet of aircraft with reserved supplies will create new bases as it proceeds to make short work of geographical mysteries. Of these pioneers of civilisation it may be said "the wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad for them." Climate will cease to be an effectual barrier against the European adventurer. He will travel through the cool winds of heaven, rise above the storm cloud, draw warmth from the machine that carries him scatheless through the fires of the tropics, or through the opal wonders of the Northern lights. The effect of this will be to give a still greater preponderance to the intellectual races of man-

kind—a vast trusteeship on behalf of the world at large. But there is much more than this.

If we succeed in the reduction of armaments, and the avoidance of war, there is something better than a negative result to be obtained. Full well we know how war sterilises human progress by diverting thought, energy, and wealth into channels which are destructive, or at the best protective. The truce which was called after Waterloo gave breathing space to European civilisation. Although it failed to secure prolonged or unbroken peace it is significant that it was followed by an expansion in literature, and by a veritable renaissance of science. After the present stormy equinox we may look for a restful summer of fruitful thought, and further voyages of discovery. We have been groping after a new science which so far has yielded us perplexing phenomena. There are some remarkable facts variously explained which have for some time past claimed the serious attention of trained enquirers. There is little doubt about the phenomena, but no generally accepted hypothesis by way of explanation. This is not the place to count the links in the chain of evidence which is lengthening in support of the governing law. It promises, however, to open a field of fresh development. The accumulation of evidence has drawn expert enquirers into the work. We may expect to find shortly that order has been introduced into the subject, and that a working hypothesis will soon appear.

Those vibrations through ether which are employed by wireless telegraphy do not exhaust the possibilities of the universal medium. We have already accepted the presence of ether throughout all space, the medium by which light and heat, as well as other forces, reach us from sun and stars. Here we are dealing with the foundation material of the Universe, the common stock of all physical existence. For whatever there may be of truth in spiritist communication, transference of thought, apparition, and unexpected mental influences, we must look to some process through ether as the reasonable interpretation of these phenomena. For if it be established that such communications are now generally acknowledged, then we may not limit the use of this medium to simply terrestrial exchange. An increase of receptivity, aided by sympathy and patience, may establish communication ultimately between ourselves and the beyond. It may also give us proof of the genesis of genius. A quickly responsive mind will avail itself to a far greater extent of that stream of cosmic thought, more wonderful than the thrice repeated shower of meteors through which the earth passes every century. To be in conscious touch with the Mind of the Universe will not only illuminate our religious ideas, but will open to us an untold wealth of observation. Future generations, having exhausted the treasure house of our own world, will draw upon the vast resources of other states of being.

It will not be necessary to summon philosophy to our aid in this extension of knowledge. Astronomical science is already satisfied that there is a universe in time and space of which the earth forms an integral part. Its boundaries are traced, and its distances

measured. There is good reason for the belief that this universe has a common life. Spectroscopic analysis has revealed in the flame of far-away suns metals in fusion with which we are familiar. The cousinship of our cosmos is really well assured. The same laws of being prevail throughout. Every part of the organisation is interrelated. Even those truant bodies flying from group to group through space are obedient to the forces of attraction and of repulsion. There is an outer darkness about which we cannot even conjecture wherein sleep the problems of immeasurable time and space. We can therefore only be concerned with æonial life, with that which precedes or that which succeeds to our present existence. Assuming that spiritism is really telepathy, we are approaching the point at which telepathy may be experimentally proved and becomes a recognised form of communication. Whether other sense impressions may also be transmitted it is not for us to assume at present, but it is possible. The resemblance between thought transmission and wireless telegraphy is suggestive. The message has only to be projected and collected. There is no medium other than that universal fluid in which "we live, and move, and have our being."

Telepathy requires the co-operation of that other subliminal self of which we have heard so much. Can that subconscious self be other than the soul, the ego, that self which will survive the human body, and find new form of expression? When science has once reduced these phenomena to working order there is hardly a limit which can be placed to the employment of the new power. Probably its use will be only occasional; conditions will have to be observed. Some personalities may prove to be more susceptible, and will therefore show the way. Hitherto we have received impressions from beyond, whether intellectual or emotional, under conditions which were limited by circumstance, more subconsciously it may be than consciously. We have only realised the strivings of the soul as they react upon our physical being. Just as light streaming towards us from myriad sources is only appreciated through the organ of sight by refraction, so the impression of cosmic thought has hitherto reached our consciousness through the intervention of some physical fact or circumstance. Presently that may be entirely changed. Here and now "we shall know as we are known."

The revolution which this will effect in our spiritual relationship cannot be measured. It may considerably modify some of our preconceived ideas, but it will certainly bring new hope and assurance. It will prove that the quality of consciousness which we call faith is not a blind process, but is as scientifically credible as are the movements of light, sound, or electricity. The truth may come to us by degrees, a science in its infancy which will demand time and labour for its development. We may yet make mistakes, mis-call some of our discoveries, and later on have to rename them. Nevertheless, we shall have entered upon a new world. When Columbus brought his three ships into the archipelago of the Gulf of Cuba he thought that he had reached some outlying point

of Asia, and the "West Indies" perpetuates his mistake to this day. But he had stumbled upon the two Americas, and changed the flow of world history. Whilst there is no limit to the possibility of such a method of communication, we can only speculate upon its ultimate direction. It is not unreasonable to suppose that having become masters of our own globe and "set our house in order," we may be permitted to get into touch with intelligent beings—if such there be—within the area of our own planetary system, perhaps still farther away in space. We should require a clearing house—mutual interpretation—unless, indeed, thought is endowed with that quality of translating itself, which would render us independent of intermediary help. But all this may have no direct relation to so-called spiritist messages. These, without any intentional fraud, may never pass beyond the telepathic control of the living by the living. If we are able to receive or to send definite messages to those who have passed into another sphere of being, it will probably come through the medium of that ever-present Spirit Who is emphatically revealed to mankind as the Comforter.

There are other questions of a more prosaic character which may be solved in the good time coming. Chemistry and electricity working together may considerably increase the output of agriculture, a matter of no little importance where a population is concentrated upon a comparatively small area, and under climatic conditions that are uncertain and often unfavourable. As the mineral and oil supplies of the earth approach exhaustion some substitute as fuel will be in growing demand. Even if coal be not destroyed at a greater rate than at present the cost of winning it will naturally increase. But coal is now being used for other purposes than fuel. Apart from its conversion into light in the form of gas there are by-products of an increasing value to the community. It will probably happen at no distant date that the value of these by-products will rival its use as an illuminant and producer of heat and energy. Coal may be mined for chemical purposes, and in its partly exhausted residual form employed for warmth and energy. This will only increase the pace of its consumption. With what are we to replace it? It has been suggested that we might harness the tides to machinery which would produce electricity to be accumulated and distributed at a considerable distance from the sea coast. This would only imperfectly replace the loss of the mineral. As we all know coal itself is the "bottled sunlight" of past ages stored in particular vegetation, and through geological changes converted into its present form. Its hidden wealth is the direct production of the sun, that sun which in every revolving year prodigally distributes light and heat through space of which the planetary system arrests a small proportion. Will it ever be possible to retain some of that sun-power for future use, converting it into a different form and storing it like another harvest? Should that be the case, the power stations would be in the tropics, and the manufacturing industries of the world would be found in the tropical and sub-tropical belts. In any case the

exhaustion of the coalfields must be accompanied by a geographical redistribution of industries, and some considerable change in the incidence of population.

But what about the men and women, our own immediate friends and neighbours who will "carry on" into this new world? So far as the writer can gather information, he is confirmed in his opinion that there is no general desire to start upon new forms of employment, or to exchange industrial association for the profound calm of country life. An allotment of land, even if accompanied by a liberal loan of capital, is not likely to convert a small farm into a profitable future for a young and energetic man. The inequality of work between summer and winter, the comparative torpor of the short days, and the long nights for at least a third of the year, will not offer much inducement either in leisure, or in any other reward, to a man fresh from the activities of soldiering. The abrupt change, the lack of society, the limited scope, are more likely to repel than to attract. The agricultural labourer may be willing to return, though even his ambition may have been stimulated to something higher than a decent living for himself and family to which his own farm production must contribute.

It is quite doubtful whether the parcelling out of England into small farms will produce that other result which is to be desired, the highest production which can be obtained in these islands. It must not be possible in the future for us to find ourselves so ill-provided from our own soil as at the beginning of this war. But production to be at its best must be nationally supervised. We must not only cultivate to the fullest extent, but grow in due rotation the character of food most suitable for the nation at large. This may involve the introduction of some new growths, such as the white beet for pulping into sugar for our native refineries. Large farms, scientific treatment, and wholesale disposal of the produce under some relaxed form of government direction, will have to be the order of the day. Although in most cases there will be a restoration of liberty to trade, as well as to our individual lives, commonsense will advise some considered modification of that freedom. It is of the greatest importance that we should restore and extend our manufacturing industries at the earliest possible moment. Labour will be available, and for some time to come wages may continue at a high level.

The present writer has advocated the establishment of a minimum wage for all trades with an automatic adjustment, at short intervals, according to the rise and fall of the cost of living. This should apply to skilled and unskilled labour alike. It is satisfactory to observe that the principle is about to be applied in the case of one prominent industry. It will be easier to determine the proper reward of labour according to rank and scale, if the cost of living be separately adjusted for all alike, skilled and unskilled. Sometimes this cost will be moving in the opposite direction to the wage value of a particular trade. It is probable that the demand for labour will continue for a considerable time. Even in this country there is a great deal of leeway to make up in commerce and industry. There is machinery to replace, depreciation to make good, and

there are extensions to be carried out which have waited for a return of peace. Then there is an immense amount of wreckage to replace in the countries which have directly suffered from the war. We can hardly suppose that British capital, of which a considerable part has passed into war loans, will suffice to meet these overwhelming demands. Already the Government has borrowed largely from the United States, and it is probable that the financial resources of the Republic will be also enlisted on behalf of British trade. It is true that America will seek to enlarge her own export business, and will be our commercial ally. But we are closer to the Continents which require help. Owing to the shortage of shipping, which can only gradually be made good, some advantage will remain with British industries. It will be found that the demand for money will force up the interest on capital, so that the cost of the finished article must continue at a comparatively high rate for some time to come. It must be remembered that the "pick" of our industrial life has been drafted into our armies. Although there are many who will never return, and some whose working power is maimed and limited, there will yet be a majority of hale, well-fed men restored to our industrial forces. The introduction of women on so large a scale into so many industries will more than supply the loss of male workers. But the people of this country made a common sacrifice, and must draw together into a closer partnership. The State has to secure the sustenance, health, and housing of the population. Class distinctions are not created simply by differences in wealth, but are interwoven with the intellectual and moral life of the people. The community will be enriched by the re-enforcement which every class must contribute to the intellectual leadership of the future.

JOSEPH COMPTON-RICKETT.

LONDON MOTHERS AND "AMERICAN WOMEN."

"And many conversed on these things as they laboured at the furrow, saying : ' It is better to prevent misery than to release from misery.' "—WILLIAM BLAKE.

A PASSAGE in Blake's "Jerusalem" came into my mind when I heard of the offer by the "American Women in London" to help the "Maternity Centre" with which I had been working. In it he says :—

"Labour well the minute particulars, attend to the little ones,
And those who are in misery cannot remain so long."

For the American Women had recognised the truth of Blake's vision that "minute particulars" are minute only in so far as it takes a specialised skill to see and a long training to detect their importance.

The "North Islington Maternity Centre and School for Mothers" is one among a number of such organisations recently started to preserve child life and child health in London and other great English cities. The North Islington Centre (like others which took the name "School for Mothers") had from the first laid stress on the educational as well as the preventive and remedial sides of the work.

In deciding to help us, "The Society of American Women in London" did not begin by spending on "bricks and mortar." They chose to help educational work, slow because it follows nature, and respects and tries to guide the deep natural affection of the mother. It is comparatively easy to add to the numbers of babies whose weekly changes of weight are recorded by the scales of a Maternity Centre. If the public conscience of England were once thoroughly awakened, we might quickly secure pure milk for every baby and mother in need of it. But the permanent maintenance of any ground gained depends upon the co-operation of the mothers themselves. And to build up among the working-class mothers of a group of streets the habits of sympathy with the ideas, and co-operation in the methods, of a Centre requires the slow process of individual influence.

A casual observer who visits one of our Centres that aims at education, may consider its claim to be doing important educational work presumptuous. It will be found, for instance, that the number of mothers who attend classes at fixed hours, even when the classes are on such practical subjects as sewing or cooking, are comparatively small. But this is discouraging only to those who know little of the daily life of a mother of the working classes. Regular attendance at a fixed hour is often impossible. But, if by education we mean the process by which a mother learns to take long views of her child's health and happiness instead of short views, then our mothers are being educated. They learn, for instance, how to sacrifice the momentary peace obtained by giving a dirty india-rubber dummy to a restless infant to suck ; or how with the patience

born of love to teach habits of self-control to a tiny mite whose life is still counted by weeks. The superintendent of a centre gives short talks on method to the mothers waiting for their turn to see the doctor. The doctor week by week gives the detailed instructions. The mother acquires a friendly relation with the skilled nurses, in which there is nothing of the patronage of the village Lady Bountiful or the rough charity of the hospital out-patients department. Day by day the mothers are brought in touch with the best modern knowledge of the conditions of child life. Without that knowledge the goodwill and unselfishness of a working man's wife would be pathetically wasted; just as without the intelligent co-operation of the mother the skill and knowledge of the best nurse and doctor can do but little.

The greater number of our mothers, whose babies are in normal health, get this education through regular attendance at the Centre, and to watch and foster it is one of the most encouraging sides of our work. But like all those who have helped in Maternity Centres we often came upon cases which we seemed powerless to help; cases that our hospitals, even in time of peace, have no place for, cases which English social organisation has so far left to their fate. These are cases of delicate babies who are suffering from malnutrition in its early and less acute stages. The chief cause of this condition we found to be the ignorance of our mothers on infant hygiene, and we had regretfully to admit that our efforts at education in those difficult instances were still unsuccessful. Again and again we had discovered both that those babies needed the start that only professional skill and watching could give them, and that the mother needed more detailed instruction than could be given to her on consultation days. In the very cases where our work could have helped most we were obliged to see children not actively diseased losing weight and vitality week by week. "If," we had often said, "we had a small ward where such babies were given a start, and where the mother could, before she took her baby home, have learnt all that was possible to keep and develop the advantage gained, what good we might do!"

Life in our great cities at all times brings an undue proportion of suffering to the poor, and above all to the mothers of the poor; but in a great and terrible war, news of death and disablement comes with ruthless disregard of the young mother's health; and through the effect of constant shocks from bad news and from air-raids the number of babies needing special care was alarmingly on the increase. It was to help such cases that "The Society of American Women in London" started a baby ward in connection with the North Islington Centre. They went to work in the spirit we have grown accustomed to look for from the compatriots of Jane Addams, Lillian Wald, and Edward Devine, a spirit in which breadth of sympathy is combined with respect and care for minute particulars. The American ward at North Islington aims not only at the good of the baby while it is in the ward, but at the good of the baby through its life, by means of the knowledge which the mother will have gained before she takes it home.

A visitor to this ward will find at present (though arrangements have already been made for the extension of the work) only a small dainty and airy room, where five little babies at a time receive, for periods varying from a day to three months, the attention of our medical officers, ward superintendent, and nurses. Everything used in the ward is as simple and inexpensive as possible, consistent with efficiency; so that the mother may reproduce these conditions in her own home, and not have to contend with the feeling of despair which comes if she thinks that at home she cannot give the child what is essential to its health. The visitor would see that the American Women have built a shelter where the babies may spend the day in the open air.

The first important point of difference between such a ward and a hospital ward is the principle on which the babies are selected for admission. They are chosen from among those babies who in attendance at our consultations have been found by our medical officers to be suffering from malnutrition in its early stages, and whose mothers are thought capable of taking advantage of our teaching and training. To make this selection our medical officers, in face of piteous individual suffering, and the crying need for more room in hospitals for every kind of suffering child, have to cultivate that valuable hardness of heart which can refuse a case whose need is great, to make room for a case whose need can be helped by the special opportunities of the ward, and which cannot be helped without them.

The next point of difference is the selection and training of the nurses in charge of the ward. There has been of late a great deal of talk about the narrowing effect of hospital training, and there can be no doubt that the gallant band of women in our hospitals, who accept, perhaps unwisely, constant overwork as a condition of their existence, have not had the same chance which comes to people of greater leisure and freedom, of developing a large social outlook. "I wish I knew what becomes of my babies," a nurse in charge of a baby ward in one of our great hospitals said to me the other day. "It's rarely we see them again, only when they are brought back with some fresh illness." The condition of her life and her work made the fulfilment of her wish impossible. In a hospital ward the number of cases, and the often critical nature of the illness, make it essential that visits from the babies' mothers should be strictly limited. A nurse may find a mother who is emotional and uncontrolled a real danger to a child's life. She may upset the confidence in the nurse that has been so gently won, or if she is dirty and careless she may be a germ carrier.

But the work of our ward nurses allows of a different relation to the mother, and was started with the aim of creating that relation. The number of cases is small, and if there is acute illness in the ward it is only now and then, and because among delicate babies acute illness, impossible to diagnose in an early stage, may develop suddenly. Our nurses then need, not only high professional skill (for the ward is no day-nursery), but they must be chosen from among those who in attaining that skill have kept

an elasticity of mind that enables them to take up new work in a new spirit.

In this ward not only the child but the mother is the nurse's special care. Our nurses must maintain discipline. The nurse's word in the ward must be law, and she may be obliged, in the last resort, to send a mother away if her presence upsets the child. But our nurses' aim is to teach the mother so to behave that she does not upset the child, and to establish terms with her that make her willing on all matters that concern her baby's health to take professional advice. The measure of success in this matter is that by which the success of the nurses in our ward is gauged.

And the opportunity is great. Our mothers come to the ward not only on visiting days, but at special times arranged by the superintendent. The mother watches the nurse handling her child, she sees the preparation of its food and the giving of its bath, and better still, she does these things herself under professional supervision. When she takes her child home she has learnt how to maintain the improvement gained. The child and the mother being members of the centre, she brings it back week by week for further advice. In "ward cases" special visitors, professionals, or volunteers working under professionals, go to the home to help the mother in carrying out the doctor's orders under home conditions. I have seen the lessons given in our ward and have talked to many mothers whose babies are in or who have been in the ward. I am convinced that the education we aim at has begun to be given, because in all the cases I have personally come across the mothers set a real value on the teaching that has been given to them. One of these, a young mother of a first baby, quite without friends or relations in London, and whose husband was at the front, said to me: "My baby is getting on splendidly now. Before I heard of you, I bought a book and followed all it said, but it isn't like seeing things done yourself. I know now what to do." Our Superintendent told me that one mother brought her little boy after he had left the ward some weeks and said with pride: "Isn't he lovely? I never take him up when he cries. I only take him up now and then for love."

It is easy to smile at the ignorance of a mother who, losing her own milk, set to work, as the men in Mrs. Gaskell's *Mary Barton*, to feed a three weeks baby with a spoon. Our nurses spend perhaps a day in teaching a fractious baby to take a bottle. It is a worrying and difficult task, but when it has been done, they send for the mother and show her how to prepare and give the food in this way. These children begin at once to gain weight and the calm that in all babies comes with health, and that means the chance of sleep for the baby's mother.

A case in which it struck me that our ward and our method had been particularly useful was one of a little boy, partially helpless on one side. While in our ward it was observed that the want of muscular control affected his sucking, and that he could not take enough milk on one side of his mouth. It was noticed that

he only got the proper quantity of food by his bottle being given much more slowly than to an ordinary child, and by its being held in a special position. This was at once pointed out to the mother, and that child is now having the chance of a proper amount of nourishment.

In giving us the opportunity of working at these "minute particulars," "The Society of American Women in London" chose work in which success can never be dramatic, and may even for some time be difficult to demonstrate by statistics. They are giving to a number of our working women, ready and eager to receive it, the best part of any education, lessons in self-mastery and in the acceptance of the guidance of reason in the use of the warmest and most unselfish impulses. They have joined the band of those who, in Blake's words, think it is "better to prevent misery than to release from misery," and in addition to the good they are doing now to the babies of London, their experiment will, if successfully carried out, have beyond a doubt a living influence on the treatment of such cases in the future.

ADA WALLAS.

LITERARY SUPPLEMENT.

LIST OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
1. THE HOUSE NOT MADE WITH HANDS. By J. E. G. DE M.	221
2. REVIEWS	226
THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS; BATTLES FOR PEACE; THE CHURCH AND CONTINUATION SCHOOLS; RECONSTRUCTION OF FAMILY LIFE; NATIONALISM AND CATHOLICISM.	
3. SHORTER REVIEWS :—" Short History of the S.P.C.K. "; " Annual Report for 1917 of the Chief Medical Officer of the Board of Education "; " Co-operation and the Future of Industry "; etc.	236
4. NOTICES OF BOOKS	240

THE HOUSE NOT MADE WITH HANDS.

THE Bishop of Wiltchester, when he held his service of thanksgiving in his cathedral for the mercies vouchsafed in the victory of Belgium and her Allies, returned thanks in an almost personal sense. He had been very anxious in the years immediately preceding the Great War as to the future of England. His own career had made his anxiety a very real thing. A man approaching sixty years, he had lived through the final phase of the Industrial Revolution, and he had almost feared that the last phase was worse than the first. But he had never lost hope since he had never lost touch with the men and women, the youths and maidens, the children of the generations among whom he had worked. His was an interesting personality and his appointment to the see of Wiltchester had created some little stir since his robust Broad Church views, his sturdy radicalism, his social delightfulness which verged on eccentricity and his large-heartedness in literature, art, music, and drama had shocked successive Prime Ministers and had appalled High Church and Low Church alike. It was with a sense of the irony of things that a Tory decided to make him the Bishop of an agricultural see. That eminent statesman differed in almost everything that seemed to matter from Dr. Edward Brake, but he recognised his great gifts and revelled in his exquisite knowledge of English cut-glass. Cynics said that Dr. Brake had exchanged a claret-glass used by James II. for a mitre. But, in fact, there was one other thing in common. The statesman and the Bishop both recognised that the reign of democracy was at hand, and the statesman said frankly to his friends that if the Church were to survive it must get out of the rut of placid ecclesiasticism rooted in intolerance. That was the real reason why this eminent Tory passed over the claims of the pushing headmaster of Richton, of the learned somniferous Dean of St. Peter's, of the saintly Hebraist who had occupied the living of Crossways just long enough to be eligible, passed them over and selected instead a man who had gone from his fellowship at Oxford to a slum curacy, and thence to a succession of slum livings in great towns where he had left the

marks of a strenuous and almost passionate pastorate. Dr. Brake had never married, but he cannot be said to have lived a solitary life. Indeed, he had a series of lives which fitted into each other like those balls of many colours that open one within the other until at last there is a secret hiding-place for which all the outer balls, so gay and delightful, exist. In this inner secret place a jewel might well rest. So it was with Dr. Brake. There was, first of all, his outer official life which was conducted with due decorum. He saw to it that his Church was a lovely place with all its mediæval charm presented in the fairest fashion. He freely spent his private fortune in restoring lost loveliness, in supplying exquisite music, a perfect choir, beautiful flowers, and from this scene of sacred art he preached his penetrating sermons which drew men and perhaps repelled women, sermons which dwelt on the essential oneness of all classes, on the duty to educate all up to the highest point of their capacity, on the necessity of making political life clean and lovely and one in which every person of every class should play a direct and earnest part. He believed in democracy while he sorrowed over it, and he preached on all the great social problems of the day with the slenderest of reference to the ecclesiastical side of things. Religion, he would say, could not come into its own while the Way of Life was cumbered with unnecessary poverty, remediable disease, curable ignorance. He declared that in preaching thus he was preaching the riches, the health, the knowledge of Christ. And he carried all this into his great dirty parish and took care to know well men and women of all classes in it. The Tories and the High Churchmen, who were many, would have hated him had it not been for other and inner regions of his complex personality. The next ball was coloured blue, or whatever was the colour of the Liberal party. He boldly identified himself with the party, attended their meetings, gave his great organising power to the local association, and after some years of effort took the constituency from the local brewer and gave it to a manufacturer who was doing his best to stamp out child labour in the mills. His political enemies did not attempt to deny that he had cleansed local politics, and it was impossible to hate a man who insisted on the defeated candidate becoming his churchwarden. The brewer could not refuse for he was caught by the Rector's third ball, the social one.

The Rector's house hummed with hospitality. He was his own housewife, and there never was such a house for beauty and order. Most houses of collectors are like museums. This was the exception. The rarest glass, porcelain, and silver were in constant use. He only bought rareties that could be used, and he exhausted the fortune that would have been spent on sons and daughters had he married on usable rareties, on editions that made a bibliophile want to be a thief, on furniture that people sat on, and lay on, and dined at just as if these exquisite products of art had been made in a modern factory. Things of beauty struck the eye on all sides, and they were humanised by use. His idea, he said, was to educate his parish in taste, and, in fact, he succeeded. How could the brewer refuse when he drank his own rarest ales out of beakers that were two centuries old, and partook of port in a glass that an expert

trembled to touch, with its tiny delicate tracery, and a stem that nature might have made? The brewer was a collector himself, and loved this impenitent, joyous host of his, who rolled out stories that crept to the Bishop's ears and made that eminent evangelical divine pray for this reprobate radical priest. But the Rector was not a penny the worse, and he gathered into his after-church suppers the young men of the parish, and taught them to love Browning and read Ruskin, and smoke cigars, and sing songs to a seventeenth-century lute which had been brought into current use. The man's social, political, and ecclesiastical activities were endless. He scandalised, fascinated, sobered the men and women, the boys and girls of his parish. But the heart or sacred place of the many balls or successive spheres that made up his personality was something other than all this, and the shrewd minister who appointed him to Wiltchester saw into part of the secret. He saw that within all the heterogeneity of the man, within the gravity of the economist, the gaiety of the host, the passion of the politician, lay a deep determination to meet the fearful dangers that must arise when a great uneducated democracy comes to rule a vast and complex social organism dependent for its very existence on lucidity of thought, on grasp of science, on purity of aim. Once when the two men met at a social function, the Rector likened the coming of an uneducated democracy into control of modern society to the flying of an aeroplane by a drunken man. It was this figure of speech that made up the Prime Minister's mind. The Rector in politics, in doctrine, in social outlook, was everything that was objectionable, but the Church and the nation needed him. So the scandal was perpetrated, and he was duly installed at Wiltchester.

There was not a great nor even a big town in the diocese. The cathedral city was a pocket of a place holding a covey of canons and a pride of retired colonels, a sort of nest or den in a fold of the southern hills. The Bishop did not resent his banishment from the scenes of multitudinous activities, and brought his tireless energies to a task that he knew would be congenial, for he sprang from a country vicarage in those very solitudes, and was determined to awaken life once again in these restful moors and pastures. He very soon settled with the social side of his city. He entertained largely and well, and made no pretence of being on the verge of the workhouse. There were too many of his clergy in that actual state for him to adopt a pose that would have been as painful as it was ridiculous. He was given to hospitality, and the retired colonels began to live once more. They spoke of the Bishop with bated breath. To them he was a phenomenon of the Early Church. And he lured into Wiltchester shy clergy and their shyer wives and daughters; shocked the former and delighted the latter, and made imperishable friendships with the sons of the clergy. A scholar himself, he gave a new impulse to scholarship, and drove many young men to one or other of the old universities. That was before the war. During the war he was busy enough as comforter and friend to all, as organiser of charities, as overseer of a thousand things. His motor-car—the Government was kind in this—became

a familiar thing in parishes that had long since forgotten the existence of a Bishop. He became a *Magister Scholarum* indeed, and the schools grew conscious of something new in life as he chatted with the teachers and the pupils, and gave them something of his unquenchable optimism.

One of his chief pleasures was his renewal of old relations with Dr. Battle, Rector of Wiltwater, his old Oxford tutor, and one who had watched his career with mixed feelings. Dr. Battle was a Tory with Socialist tendencies, and there was a gulf of opinion between his views and the broad liberalism of his Bishop. But that fact made the renewal of touch the more delightful. It was a joy to cross swords with this Bishop, who was so very unepiscopal, so very human, so boisterously delightful, and so wholly good. Meetings were frequent, and the bed that the Rector could offer made unofficial visitations possible in the remotest corners of the diocese. Mr. Oldham was proud to show the Bishop his library, and the Bishop grew almost envious over the books, over rareties that he was longing to add to his own choice library. To Mr. Oldham the Bishop was a bibliophile and that was enough. To the headmaster of the grammar school the Bishop seemed the incarnation of scholarship, and the boys were taught to look on the visitant as a being who made perfect Latin verses in his sleep. But the boys were not deceived, for they had seen the Bishop drive his own car into Wiltwater. A man who could negotiate that hill at that speed had other things to think of at night. So the boys and the head were both satisfied. So it was everywhere, and even the clergy who disapproved of his ecclesiastical views had to submit to the views of wives and daughters and adjust their ritual accordingly. The diocese in an amazingly short period took on a broadness of tone that would have pleased Saint Paul himself. The Bishop revelled in his native air, returned to the dialect of his youth with a facility that delighted every soul in the diocese, and became before the end of the war the father of an admiring people. By that time he had gripped the problems that lay before him, and these he talked over freely with Dr. Battle. Education was the first. Rural education was, he had always known it, the great difficulty to be faced. There were few facilities for higher education, and none at all for technical training. But these were not the main difficulties. The thing that troubled him most was the housing question.

"It is here, my dear Rector," he said, "that I cannot see my way. People admire the beauty of these villages, and so do I. But I am a practical man. I love lovely things, but I only love them if I can use them. How can people *use* these cottages? Every inconvenience known to man is to be found in connection with them. Ill-lit, unprovided with water, unhealthy from every point of view, they are often unfit for pigs to live in. Yet they look beautiful. How are we to solve the question? Is beauty inconsistent with health, with comfort, with life? Of course it is not. Look at the children. They are not nearly so healthy as my slum children. They have more disease, are dirtier, are unhappier in a land that is redolent of health. No doubt it is partly the landlord's fault, but

he, poor man, gets little enough return on his money. It is my fault, your fault, everybody's fault. We are wasting the best material in the world, and we talk about the beauties of the old English villages."

"And the worst remains to be told," said the Rector dryly. "If you gave many of them a model village to-morrow, with every convenience, things would be very little better. Government schemes of housing are all very well, but unless you teach people how to live in a house, better wages and better houses will not solve the problem in our time."

"Yes, I said that it was your fault, Dr. Battle, and now you are convicted out of your own mouth. Why have you never taught them how to live in a house? That was your business, and you have not done it. I have a mind to make you a canon and take you away from the scenes of your misspent life." And the Bishop laughed, for he knew the answer, and tried to counter it before it came. "I know that you will say that you have tried to teach them the ultimate virtues, goodness, purity, honesty, kindness. But you have never taught them to open their windows and wash their children, and clean their houses." The Bishop waited for the answer which was so long coming that he lit a cigar with entirely unepiscopal precision.

The old Rector pondered and thought. At last he said, rather coldly: "I know all you mean. More has been done than perhaps you know. You are comparatively young and in a hurry. I am a Platonist, and alas! seem to have taught you Plato badly. At the back of my mind this housing problem, which lies behind all education, since it is a matter that affects the family which is ultimately the chief educative force, has ever been working. From the first it has seemed to me that pending action by the State on a large scale, what we clergy had to do was to make family life secure, to prevent it from dissipating. I have always had in view a house not made with hands, a perfect house holding the perfect family. In a sense, I have been a sort of spiritual draughtsman or architect planning for this very day which has come. I quite agree, indeed I told you just now, that the slum mind will destroy the model village, will in a few weeks transform it into a slum. Knowing this I have tried to work at that mind, to transform it into something better, and I have found at least this, that it is transformable. That is something. I have fought for family life and not without success. That is something. I have pictured Christmas after Christmas the ideal family, the family where Christ the Carpenter lived, and I have shown him at work in the house making it fit for habitation. That is something. I have told them that the house not made with hands is something within the reach of everyone. I did what I could. I think the men we sent abroad have justified my belief. They had not got slum minds, and when they come back they will demand something other than slums. If I am to blame so are you."

"I have already admitted it," said the Bishop.

"Yes, but you can get to work now. You can work hand in

hand with councils and committees in a way that we clergy cannot. You can help in a hundred ways."

"I am hard at it," said the Bishop, "and am proposing to corrupt—if I may use the term—not only the County Council but all the District Councils. But, there, let us leave the subject. Just look at the hill-side." A moving white mist that had a warm touch of spring in it was creeping in patches up the wide expanse, and the distant hill beneath the clear sunny February sky seemed to be dotted with innumerable tabernacles nestling in the brown bracken of last year, and round the gorse already gay with bloom. It seemed almost as if an army were camping there in tiny snow-white huts. It was a curious spectacle, unreal, spiritual, almost startling. It was, as it were, a vision of things to be, a sort of hint that homes not made with hands were even then in the making on that lone and lovely hill.

J. E. G. DE M.

REVIEWS.

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.*

The dream of thinkers, jurists, and statesmen of many centuries seems to be coming true at last. The new "Roman Empire" of which Dante in his *De Monarchia* wrote, the one nation containing many nations, seems at hand. The proposed League of Nations for the abolition of war and the regulation of peace is seen to be a practical thing, and the Great Conference now sitting at Paris, when it has settled the future of Germany and Russia will settle too the form of the new combination of States. The proposition is not really so complex as some critics have thought, but it must incorporate certain principles, principles which are already operative in the relations of free man and free man, and must apply between free nation and free nation. Men, while remaining free, co-operate for the purpose of preventing private war, which we call crime, and for the purpose of regulating the duties of the group of men engaged in the co-operative act. Long evolution has given us the power of constitutional action. It has now to be applied to the co-operation of nations in such a fashion that public war will become as much a crime as private war, and that the organisation of the affairs of nations shall be a purely legal process. To secure these things each nation must be really free; its personality must not be absorbed in the great group of which it is a part; each nation must learn to control itself, and be prepared

* (1) *The League of Nations: A Practical Suggestion*. By Lt.-Gen. the Right Hon. J. C. Smuts, P.C. (Hodder & Stoughton. 6d. net.)

(2) *The League of Nations and its Problems*. By L. Oppenheim. (Longmans. 6s. net.)

(3) *A Permanent League of Nations*. By Sir George Paish. (Fisher Unwin. 6s. net.)

to sacrifice something of its freedom in exchange for a similar sacrifice on the part of other nations; each nation must be ready to submit to the international rule of law and to recognise the sanctions of compulsion that will be necessary to enforce that rule of law. There is nothing very complex, though there is a good deal that is unfamiliar in all this. The main thing is the will to co-operate, and that exists. Most books which deal with the question of a League of Nations enunciate something like these principles, and, indeed, are preaching to the converted. The Great War has made us all ready to sacrifice something more than has already been sacrificed to secure the Great Peace. Sir George Paish tells us that the formation of the League "will not merely diminish anxiety about the future, it will eliminate the *cause* of that anxiety." This is true enough, but we must not forget that in the society of nations as in the various societies of men, there will be criminals, against whom the utmost watchfulness will be necessary. Anxiety there will be because of this fact, but it is thus even more true that co-operation "is the only policy that can give to the nations security under modern conditions." The fact of co-operation will eliminate national competition in the economic world in the worst sense of that term. No nation can claim to make a corner in any market, and with this security the normal competition between individual traders will be carried on to the entire benefit of the consumer.

But meantime we have our old earth here. We have not yet got the League of Nations, though the co-operation of the Entente Powers is a forerunner of the League. What are the necessary steps that will have to be taken if we are to secure a really sound international co-operative system? Professor Oppenheim, in these three Whewell lectures draws "attention to the links which connect the proposal for a League of Nations with the past, to the difficulties which stand in the way of the realisation of the proposal, and to some schemes by which these difficulties might be overcome." These lectures were delivered before the collapse of Germany, and it is interesting to note that Professor Oppenheim's first condition of a League, the utter defeat of the Central Powers, has been accomplished. He assumes that this defeat will involve the disappearance of the spirit of militarism "which is not compatible with a League of Nations." We hope that this is so. He considers that the aims of the League should be three: To prevent the outbreak of war through (a) legal, (b) political disputes, and to provide a joint police that would check a resort to arms by those who refuse to submit legal questions to an International Court of Justice, and political questions to an International Council of Conciliation. It will therefore be necessary to organise the League, to provide for legislation within the League, the administration of justice within the League, and the administration of mediation within the League. The difficulties are dealt with, and perhaps overcome, in the second lecture. Certainly the creation of the necessary machinery is difficult, and the chief difficulty is in keeping it simple. In the third lecture Professor Oppenheim sets out to show us his mechanism of Justice and Mediation, and we have no doubt that the proposals will be

closely considered. In fact, in the course of the present great Conference it is likely that International Courts of Justice will be founded, and no doubt, to some extent, they will be formed on lines similar to those indicated here. We do not think that a Court of Appeal is a necessity. The Court should be strong enough to deal with any issue. At any rate, there should be no question of rehearing, and the possibilities of appeal on questions of pure law should be very limited. In questions of mistakes an application to the original Court would be sufficient. However, these are matters of detail. Some sort of International Court of Justice is coming. This year will certainly see its formation.

General Smuts, a great thinker on international legal questions, and one of the most eminent international law scholars that the University of Cambridge has produced, declares in his weighty little book that the discussion of the League of Nations "has proceeded far too much on general or academic lines." He therefore gives us "in rough outline what appears to be a practical, workable scheme." The League must be

"A great organ of the ordinary peaceful life of civilisation. . . . It must become part and parcel of the common international life of States, it must be an ever visible, living, working organ of the policy of civilisation. It must function so strongly in the ordinary peaceful intercourse of States that it becomes irresistible in their disputes; its peace activity must be the foundation and guarantee of its war power."

The great Empires of the world have broken down, and to-day "the British Commonwealth of Nations remains the only embryo league of nations because it is based on the true principles of national freedom and political decentralisation." In the present "*débâcle* of the old Europe the League of Nations is no longer an outsider or a stranger, but the natural master of the house." General Smuts thinks that it is necessary to form the League at once in order to deal with the vast multiplicity of territorial, economic, and other problems with which the Conference is faced; that the League when formed should be, so far as Russia, Austria-Hungary, and Turkey are concerned, the reversionary of the people and the territories, with a power to delegate this authority to any State as agent, or mandatory for it, under special restrictions as to economics and the use of forces of control. General Smuts would allow no new State to enter the League "unless on condition that its military power and armaments shall conform to a standard laid down by the League in respect of it from time to time." The League as the successor of dissolved empires would directly watch over "the relations *inter se* of the new independent States arising from the break-up of those Empires." General Smuts compares the scheme with the working arrangements of the British Empire, that nearest approach to the League of Nations, and sees important similarities in the Imperial Conferences for formulating common policy, and the position of Crown Colonies and Protectorates, which are looked after or administered by the

individual principal constituent States, and possess the open door and the non-military police policy advocated in this book for the territories which are to be overlooked by the great League of Nations.

The League should manifest itself in a General Conference or Congress of all the constituent States, of the nature of a Parliament. In this body *all* States should be equal. There would also be an Executive Council of the League for administrative purposes, and this body would do the real work. It would be composed of representatives of the British Empire, France, and Italy, the United States of America, and Japan (and Germany "as soon as she has a stable democratic Government"), with four additional members added in rotation from two panels, one of important intermediate Powers such as Spain, and the other of all Minor Powers, members of the League. This would give the Major Powers a bare majority and would give great weight to the views of the minor Powers. It should be pointed out that a bare majority is not sufficient. Germany, for instance, might corrupt and vote with dissident Minor Powers. In its business arrangements the Council will follow largely the precedent of the Versailles Council of Prime Ministers working through a General Staff, and controlling international administrative bodies dealing with international subjects such as post, trade, sanitation, navigation of rivers, liquor trade, fisheries, white slave traffic. The difficulties are enormous, and can only be dealt with by a permanent staff. They could not be dealt with at all in any adequate fashion, as we know too well, without the League and its machinery. General Smuts gives us a most practical scheme, and makes the student feel that any other scheme would be inadequate. But before all this the practical certainty of peace must be secured. General Smuts pleads "most earnestly" for the abolition of conscription at the present Peace Conference. A simple militia system "on a scale of numbers and service agreed by the League" is the best alternative, though Great Britain will certainly adhere to her voluntary system. The scale of armament or equipment on a fair basis for such forces as are sanctioned should be determined after inquiry by the council, and armament factories should be nationalised. So far as actual war is concerned, General Smuts feels that "as long as members of the League submit their disputes for inquiry and report, or recommendation, or decision by some outside authority, their obligation to the League will be satisfied, and thereafter they will be free to take any action they like, and even to go to war." That is the practical position. It is useless to forbid war; it is possible to make it very difficult, and thus check designs of personal ambition. A League so constituted with power to bring pressure on its members to act rightly and justly, will also be able to coerce evil designs by nations outside the League. General Smuts seems to us to have adopted a policy of a singularly practical character, and one that appears to be almost inevitable, both in its logic and its prospects of success in practice.

J. E. G. DE M.

BATTLES FOR PEACE.*

These war stories come at a time when the agony of the past four years is relieved, and when the mind can, to some extent, dwell calmly on the outcome of the terrible struggle. Knowing the end, it is easier to write of the ebb and flow, and events fall into their proper perspective when viewed from the standpoint of accomplishments.

The author in this small volume tells the story of the Great War for children. It is a book that fills a need, for it puts on record for young students in a brief and clear narrative the engagements and battles which went to the making of the Armistice of November 11th, 1918, in the light of which we are now rejoicing.

The first chapter of this book deals with the origin of the war, "Why Europe went to war." Above all things, it is necessary that a clear understanding of Britain's entrance into the war should be taught to present and future generations. In the past, war was entered into with sometimes a light heart, and oftentimes without sufficient reason, but not so in the present struggle, and it is of the utmost importance that this fact should be fully appreciated and taught, so that in the years to come no one will be able to cast a stone at Britain, and say that she strove and fought for her own aggrandisement, when her children one and all can rise up and give an answer for the faith that is in them; knowing full well the cause for which her sons gave their all without grudging and without question, to maintain the honour of her word, the sacredness of her promise which she had given to Belgium.

"To the other countries of Europe the promise was sacred. When war was declared between Germany and France the English Government called on both countries to promise to respect Belgian neutrality, and it also asked Belgium to defend herself against any army invading her lands. This Belgium was prepared to do with the last drop of her blood. France gave the promise but Germany took no notice. On August the fourth news came that German troops were already in Belgium. England had striven to keep the peace, but now her honour demanded that she should join in the war. On this same memorable day, August the fourth, she declared war against Germany, and prepared to throw the force of her little army into the scale of nations fighting for right and freedom against the intolerable tyranny and aggression of Prussia."

It is not only in books such as the one under review that efforts are being made to enlighten the youth of to-day as to the events of the past four years, but the Cinema has taken up the idea, and by showing through the medium of the film "My Four Years in Germany," by Mr. Gerard, is helping to make the picture-loving public more clear in their comprehension as to the origin of the war.

These "Battles for Peace" cover, indeed, a wide front, and

* *The Story of the Great War told for Children.* By Elizabeth O'Neill, M.A. (Hodder & Stoughton. 3s. 6d. net.)

give the reader a rapid survey from country to country by land, sea, and air. They are told in so simple a manner that every child who runs may read and learn the main features of the history of the Great War, from which we are at last emerging with hope and faith that Peace may follow and prevail among the nations that have suffered untold sufferings, and have given their all in the cause of freedom—freedom for all time to come. The authoress is to be congratulated on a most useful contribution to the literature of the war.

* * *

S. DE M.

THE CHURCH AND CONTINUATION SCHOOLS.*

This Report of the Committee presided over by the Bishop of Norwich records the evidence on the subject of adolescent education of a number of experienced witnesses, and arrives at some very important conclusions. There can be little doubt that the great problem of our time is the education of children and young persons between the ages of twelve and eighteen years. The new Education Act creates the machinery for achieving this end by the abolition of the greater part of child labour and the formulation of the law that all young persons up to the age of eighteen shall attend school for a certain number of hours in each year. The principle of compulsion for higher education is at last recognized, though the full operation of the principle, unless Parliament intervenes, cannot take place for some seven years. But it is certain that the compulsory sections of the new Act will, to some extent, come into operation during the present year, and all local authorities and all other bodies interested in the education of adolescents are looking about for ways and means to provide the necessary education. It is common knowledge that the London County Council and the Church of England educational authorities are proposing to work together with a view to the due carrying out of the new Education Act. Now this Report, drawn up by experts holding the most various educational views, comes with certain definite proposals based on the evidence given before the Committee. This Committee declare on the evidence before it that "all schemes aiming at the strengthening, enlightenment, and elevation of the spiritual element should include well-considered and sympathetic efforts for the health and development of the whole man." Adolescent education must include "an appeal to the active as well as to the receptive faculties." The Boy Scouts and Girl Guides movements are evidence that action for others is a desire that is common to all young persons, and should be fostered in all spheres of higher education. These are fundamental principles. When we come to actual teaching we find that the Committee takes the following view:—

We may . . . safely assume in the light of the testimony before the Committee, that if boys and girls between fourteen

* *National Society's Special Committee on the Provision by the Church of Religious Instruction for Adolescents: Report.* (National Society, 12, Prince's Street, W. 1. 6d. net.)

and eighteen, after leaving Elementary Schools, are presented with opportunities of receiving really enlightening instruction in literature, history, economics, art, and the natural sciences, and very particularly in the scientific principles underlying the industries in which they are engaged, they would welcome the prospect, some for studies and some for others, with great cordiality. But it must also be understood that there must be the largest possible freedom of choice in regard to the subjects chosen for study, and no attempts whatever must be made to restrict the instruction offered to a few recognised types.

This conclusion indicates the great range of adolescent education anticipated by the Committee—an education based on physical health and self-determination—built up on a wise selection of the greatest subjects brought within the grasp of developing minds. If the ambition that we all have for the children of the land is as great as this, it is obvious that the problem must be treated as a whole. There can be no scrappy efforts here and there. “The difficulties of the problem are enormous, both for Church and State,” and “it is only by the most enlightened co-operation between them that any approach to a satisfactory solution can be achieved.” The Committee consider that “the religious forces of the nation at large must be thrown into the great task now opened up of raising the whole level of education for the youth of the masses of the people.” To secure this there should be a national appeal, perhaps launched by a sermon in St. Paul’s Cathedral, for volunteers to work in the Local Education Committee Continuation Schools, volunteers who will be ready to be trained for the art of teaching in adolescent schools.

It is believed that teachers could be obtained in considerable numbers from the old and new Universities, University Colleges, Associations of Women and Girls, Clubs and Associations of Public School Men and Women, and others, who have united together for personal social work. It may reasonably be expected that Local Education Authorities would welcome those who come forward. It will rest with the authorities to be satisfied as to the ability of the applicants and to settle rates of remuneration.

We are sure that such an appeal from St. Paul’s, or, better still, an appeal in the Press by the Archbishop of Canterbury and some leading representatives of other churches for teachers, and announcing that premises likely to be useful would be offered to the local authorities, would meet with a warm, indeed, an enthusiastic reception. The Church of England has a unique opportunity to-day, one that may not recur. If the opportunity is taken, then we shall see at an early date a larger hope brooding over the destinies of England than is visible to-day.

* * *

RECONSTRUCTION OF FAMILY LIFE.*

We desire to call special attention to this *brochure*, issued by the Belgian *Ligue de l’Education Familiale*, which was formed in

* *Le Bonheur National par La Famille*, par A. Licensier. Bruxelles, A. de Wit. 53, Rue Royale. (Prix : 30 centimes ; 20 francs le cent.)

1899, and has its headquarters at 14, Rue Victor Lefèvre, Brussels. The publication has a curious interest in the fact that it was published in October last, and managed to evade the strict German censorship. The Belgian press, in fact, never died during the brutal German occupation. It survived by all sorts of ingenious devices, and this patriotic, and more than patriotic, booklet is a good instance of Belgian persistence under great difficulties.

A sense of patriotic duty is the source of the pamphlet: "A une période de misères, et souffrances courageusement endurées, doit succéder une ère de bonheur et de prospérité." But this entirely depends on the healthiness of family life, on the influence of parents over children. The influence of Church and school is minute compared with the influence of the home. For every hundred parents there are only one priest and two school teachers, and thus if during the first twenty years of a person's life 2,000 hours are spent at church and 8,000 at school we find, if we multiply in the case of a hundred families the duration of action of the priest, teachers, and parents, that the Church secures 2,0000 hours, the school 16,000 hours, and the family 9,700,000 hours. Thus the home influence might be overwhelmingly good, and if there is, as there often is, improper delegation of family authority, it might be, and often is, overwhelmingly bad. It is plain that the preservation and reconstruction of family life is, not only for Belgium but all the world, the one thing that greatly matters. In such reconstruction, moreover, we should find that "Le zèle de l'Eglise et celui de l'école pourront donner un meilleur rendement."

M. Lecensier pleads for what he calls "preventive education." It is only by this means that we can exercise the most important of the arts, "l'art de former la génération de main." This is the exact attitude adopted by Sir George Newman in his plea for preventive medicine in relation to school life. And in both cases of prevention the goal can only be gained through the family. The family makes or unmakes the child by means of its continuous environment. Therefore we must educate the family. To-day a great proportion of parents are not really cognisant of the elementary duties of family life, or of the true relation of the family to society. All thinkers and social workers realise that the larger part of social evils springs from the misdirected efforts or the negligence of parents who have never been taught to perform their duty to their children, or, indeed, to their neighbours. This pamphlet tells us of the great efforts that are being made in Belgium to train parents in the art of bringing up the next generation. This is the twentieth year of *La Ligue de l'Education Familiale*.

"Dès le début elle a organisé des conférences et des cours, publié des brochures, organisé des congrès importants, édité une revue mensuelle, &c., en vue d'amener les parents à 'élever' leurs enfants dans le plein sens du mot. Depuis la guerre elle a redoublé d'activité, accentué sa propagande; elle fait appel à tous pour contribuer à la rénovation morale du pays par l'agent le plus puissant de la formation de la jeunesse: la famille éducatrice."

Some such propaganda should be at work here. A pamphlet on the lines of the one now before us should, through the agency of churches, chapels, and schools, be delivered in every home in the kingdom. We pride ourselves on the sacredness of family life in England, but little enough is done to keep that life alive. We need in this country to initiate on a large scale a movement similar to that which has done so much in Belgium. We commend this *brochure* to those who think, as we think, that such a movement can be carried out here with success.

* * *

NATIONALISM AND CATHOLICISM.*

Lord Hugh Cecil, both as a speaker and a (too rare) writer, is always interesting and suggestive if not as convincing as his essentially logical mind would seem to render likely. This lengthy tract for the times is no exception to the rule. It is a piece of close reasoning from beginning to end, and is designed to show that unlimited self-centred nationalism is a great evil, and that if the Society of Nations is to be a reality we must move "from the national to the catholic ideal"—that is to say from a mere selfish absorption in national life to a world in which the Church of Christ is a unifying force.

Nationalism has reigned supreme for centuries and still reigns. Catholicism gets nothing but lip service; and while other parts of the Christian revelation are still constantly showing their power over human action, this particular group of tenets, although unanimously accepted by Christian people, has become feeble and ineffectual, a futility which no one denies and no one observes.

Here, then, is surely a work which the various Christian bodies throughout the world might well undertake. Their power is often hindered by their disagreement. But in these matters there is no disagreement. The beliefs that are necessary to place the claim of the Universal Christian Society (however that expression be interpreted) above the claim of nationality are part of the common teaching of all Christians. Christendom can therefore speak with a united voice. And it can give to any diplomatic or political movement for abolishing war that power and validity without which such a movement must certainly fail. . . . What patriotism did in training clans and tribes, Catholicism must do to tame nations. The opportunity is a unique one in human history. . . . If, during the next thirty or forty years, during the natural respite which exhaustion will ensure, every Christian teacher has constantly in view as the primary duty of his vocation to preach the superiority of the Catholic over the national claim, something might well be done to move the allegiance of men to its true seat. . . . By this path, and by this alone, can we reach perpetual peace. Catholic sentiment can alone securely bind humanity together. It is only when the glory of the nations has been brought within the City of God that we can hope to be free from the agony of war, or to allay the sufferings of mankind by the healing leaves of the tree of life.

* *Nationalism and Catholicism*. By Lord Hugh Cecil. (Macmillan. 1s. net.)

This first conception is, of course, not new. It was, indeed, preached by Dante, and from not altogether different premises. It is interesting to note the steps, or some of the steps, by which Lord Hugh Cecil reaches a conclusion that is really intuitive in the minds of all deep observers of human society. Lord Hugh begins by condemning the discipline of military training as such since it, in common with the practice of many religious orders, subordinates the individual to the State (or the Order), and involves complete surrender of will and responsibility for the purposes of (in the case of the State) War. Lord Hugh is clear enough that "when it is waged for a purpose both righteous and sufficient war is right. A particular war may be right or wrong. It may be right, like the war England declared upon Germany on August 4th, 1914, or it may be wicked, like that made a day earlier by Germany upon Belgium." It is only right to interrupt Lord Hugh's argument at this point by saying that his assumption as to the surrender of will and responsibility by a soldier is not true in the case of the English soldier. The doctrine of superior orders does not justify an English soldier in committing a crime even in wartime. The soldier is always responsible to the civil courts. It is somewhat surprising that Lord Hugh Cecil has overlooked this fact. But, of course, it is true that a soldier has as his main business the work of destroying the opposing army as an army, and in the course of carrying out this objective it is his duty to kill them against whom as individuals he has no personal cause of quarrel. Lord Hugh says that even a righteous war "is in its method a departure from Christianity almost as complete as can be conceived." We are not so sure about this as is the author of this book. Our Lord recognised the necessity of armed control, and of armies. We see this from the story of the Centurion's daughter. The infliction of pain, the causing of death even, is not necessarily evil. It depends on the moral attitude of the persons responsible. The world indeed is so constituted that progress has hitherto been associated with pain. It is the desire to give pain that forms the complete departure from Christianity, and we cannot see that it is sound to say that on the one hand the true self-sacrificing citizen-soldier "walks not unworthily in the steps of Christ," but that "the State uses him, not for Christ's work, but for the devil's." This entirely depends on the character of the State, and the character of the State depends on the character of its citizens. If the war is really a holy war, then the soldier, in so far as he is a good man, is doing God's work.

But while saying this we feel as strongly as Lord Hugh Cecil that the absorption of the individual in the State is a bad and evil thing. However, that is not our English conception of the State. That is the German conception of the State, a thing in itself. The English conception of the State is that of a combination of individuals created for the purpose of enlarging, and not absorbing, the personality of the individual. If the State is regarded from this point of view it is a good, a very good, thing,

and not an evil thing at all, and the distinction which Lord Hugh Cecil makes between patriotism and Nationalism is unsound. It is untrue to say "Patriotism is good; Nationalism is evil" if Nationalism means, as it does mean according to our English theory, that the State exists, as the Roman State existed, for the purpose of enlarging the imperfect status of the individual. Therefore, we are not prepared to condemn Nationalism as such, nor is it necessary to do so for the purpose of Lord Hugh's argument. What we need is unselfish Nationalism, as we need unselfish individualism, and that must be secured if we are ever to have a peaceful world. Nationalities must be ready, as Lord Hugh says, to surrender something in order to become part of a great international confederation, as the individual has to surrender something he is to be a happy member of a family, a clan, a tribe, a nation. It is only by the surrender of self that self can fully manifest itself. This is as true of nations as of individuals, and we are sure that every true nationality has an immense deal to contribute to the moral and spiritual, as well as the material, wealth of the world. It is selfishness which is the evil, and this can only be eradicated by an approach to the catholic ideal which Lord Hugh Cecil dwells upon so movingly. But it is unnecessary and harmful to contrast the national with the Catholic ideal. To do so is really to go back on the whole argument. It is desirable for nations to realise themselves, to reveal their essential virtues and gifts, and this can only be done by self-sacrifice, but not by surrender of will and responsibility, even to a Catholic world. The nation, like the individual, must preserve its individuality, and can best do this by shedding its selfishness while preserving its character. That can only be done by the forces of Christianity. The problem, then, is to find a Foch who can, in the realm of faith, do what Marshal Foch has done in the realm of arms. Can the Christian churches federalise and become a great force in the future of the world? That is the question. Let us, begin, at any rate, within the Empire, and undo the evils that four centuries of ever-multiplying divisions, the divisions that Bossuet declared to be inevitable in Protestantism, have produced.

SHORTER REVIEWS.

Mr. W. K. Lowther Clarke, the editorial secretary of the Society, has given us in his "Short History of the S.P.C.K." (Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1s. ; 2s. cloth) a volume that should stir new interest in this ancient and wonderful association of workers. In 1898 an official history was issued to mark the second centenary of the Society. The present slighter book is definitely written to attract new subscribers since the Society's income "has suffered considerably as the result of war conditions," and there are new and vast burdens of work looming ahead. The Archbishop of Canterbury in his preface supports the objects and commends the book "with confidence." The volume opens with a picture of post-Restoration England, a sad enough picture, but not so

sad as the social conditions of the poor at that date seem to demand. The beginnings of the Society go back to the year 1678—when in fact Tillotson and Baxter were working together and Gouge was in the thick of his Welsh evangelical work—when Dr. Horneck organised the meetings of certain young Londoners in search of spiritual light. On March 8th, 1698-1699, the five original members of the Society met at the house of Mr. Justice Hooke; there were, in addition to their host, Lord Guildford, Colonel Colchester of Westbury-on-Severn, Sir Humphrey Mackworth of the Middle Temple, and the famous Dr. Bray, the real founder. The proceedings of the Society founded on that day up to June 1st, 1704, have been edited (with a collection of letters from the Society's correspondents) by Canon McClure. The letters make it clear that the country clergy were waiting for a lead. In 1700 the Society was hard at work on foreign missions, and as the S.P.G. was confined by charter to the English Colonies the S.P.C.K. had a free field in India and elsewhere. The Annual Report for 1825 refers to the transference of the S.P.C.K. Indian Missions to the S.P.G. The account of the charity schools in England will be read with interest. Some references might have been made to Blake's famous poem on the subject, and perhaps such a frank writer as Mr. Lowther Clarke might have referred to the fact that the schools were in their late eighteenth century days very ineffective educationally, and to the fact also that the earliest of these voluntary schools was a Roman Catholic school in the days of James II., a school that roused Tillotson to the point of competition. The Society at the end of the eighteenth century was, as was the Established Church and all education, at a low ebb, and the "S.P.C.K. was one of the latest organisations to which a breath of life came." This was happily "stung into activity by the founding of young and vigorous organisations, especially by the Bible, Church Missionary and National Societies"; and may we not add the British and Foreign School Society? A decade after the close of the first century it began to renew its life. Between 1816 and 1820 it quadrupled its members, and became a great home as well as foreign evangelising society in very dark irreligious days. Expansion never ceased. In 1836 the Society became its own publishers, and spent £40,000 in purchasing stock and fitting out a new depot. The educational work was invaluable. It is not generally known that between 1870 and 1892 the Society contributed £25,000 in three grants for the building and enlarging of elementary Church Schools, and largely subsidised the training colleges which, between 1870 and 1874, the Society examined and inspected. Moreover, a system of diocesan inspections was inaugurated by the S.P.C.K. The present work of the Society at home, afloat and abroad is here set forth in detail. The work in connection with emigration to the Colonies has been invaluable, and since that work must now be vastly increased it will be understood that great help in matters of money is urgently needed. We trust that it will be forthcoming. The Society, to-day, as its vigorous publishing house testifies, is full of life, and we trust that all the support possible will be tendered to it by a grateful and expectant public. The support that the Society can give to the revival of English education is endless.

* * *

"The Annual Report for 1917 of the Chief Medical Officer of the Board of Education" (H.M. Stationery Office or any bookseller, 1s. net) is one of the most important official educational documents that has been issued in recent times, and should be closely studied by all persons

engaged either in social or educational work. Sir George Newman in his preface declares that "the School Medical Service, as concerned with the whole nurture of childhood and youth, must be and remain an integral part of the public system of education, which is not inconsistent with its effective correlation with other health services. The interaction of physical, mental and moral qualities renders it impossible to provide for their full development and stability, except in organic relation to one another. The School Medical Service should not be regarded only as an agency superimposed on other agencies for the public benefit. . . . For the future which lies before us we want not only more children but better children, as the foundation of a new people." It must be remembered that it "is not a dispensary system; it is an educational system of preventive medicine." The Education Act, 1918, lays emphasis upon the fact that the business of the School Medical Service is "the advancement of the health and physical development of the whole child population of school age." When once we have caught up the present terrible arrears of disease and physical defect in the children of this country then a great system of preventive medicine in the schools will give us for the future a really healthy adult population. Prevention is not only better than cure: it is a necessity of national life. The new Act will give us when it is well at work medical oversight of the vast bulk of the population from the age of two to eighteen. But this Report shows that there is an immense field to cover. Child health is far worse in the country than in towns, and the number of sick and defective children in country and town alike is a terrible monument of parental and social carelessness and ignorance. The slow necessary process of reconstructing national life from the physical basis is carefully traced in these fascinating pages and it is certain that the problem is being approached from the right direction. But Sir George Newman needs every possible backing from the local authorities, from parents, from the Press and from Parliament itself. Unless a great joint effort is made and a vast campaign instituted for the training of parents and local authorities, we shall at the best prevent things getting worse. A million children to-day are incapable of securing full or indeed any adequate results from the educational system of this country. That is the crying evil of the hour. Victory over ignorance and disease is as essential as victory over external enemies. This can only be secured by unity of effort. Sir George Newman and his able assistants can give us the policy we need, but that policy requires the co-operation of all persons directly or indirectly concerned in the working of our national education. We are sure if the facts are brought out in every publication in the land that he will secure the backing that he needs. It is here that the Press can help. There is unhappily much slackness still on the subject among local authorities and publicity alone can cure the defect. Everyone pleads for a healthy England. If everyone would work for it we should get it within a decade.

* * *

Mr. Leonard S. Woolf in "Co-operation and the Future of Industry" (George Allen & Unwin, Ltd. 5s. net) looks forward to the development of the co-operative movement "into a great democratic industrial system." A great co-operative movement is indeed already in existence. There are 1,400 Co-operative Societies and over 3,000,000 members, supplying about ten million persons in these islands with goods to the value of about £100,000,000, and in doing this "we are competing, and competing successfully, in practically every large town throughout the country with the ordinary private or capitalist concern. We are already

carrying on industry on a vast scale; we have our own factories, depots, and estates scattered up and down the length of Great Britain, in Denmark, Greece, Australia, Canada, Spain, India and Ceylon." So the co-operator comforts himself as to the future, for he believes that co-operation is not only democratic but economic. That is true if economic co-operation is worked on sound, honest lines upon a strictly business basis following the rules of supply and demand. This book deals with associations of consumers called co-operative stores or societies. In 1916 there were only 103 producers' societies as against 1,373 consumers' societies. The growth of the former would revolutionise the economic basis more quickly than the growth of the latter, but the importance of the latter can hardly be over-estimated, and we commend this account of the movement which began at Rochdale in 1844 to the attention of the student of economics and to those who are watching the opening of new methods of industrial and social life. The Central Education Committee of the Co-operative Union is wise in placing at the head of its annual programme a definition of co-operative education as "the training of men and women to take part in industrial and social reforms and civic life generally." This Union and the English Women's Co-operative Guild should place themselves in touch with local education authorities and help to promote the new day continuation schools and supply teachers. Co-operation is not limited to the supply and demand of commodities. There must be co-operation of all classes in social life. If there is not, co-operation as an economic fact will lose its effect as an agent of larger national life. The so-called Co-operative Party must, if it is ever to mean anything in politics, be entirely non-sectional. This view is strongly held by Mr. Woolf in his very interesting and attractive book.

* * *

Sir George Henschel's "Musings and Memories of a Musician" (Macmillan, 1918) will be read with pleasure by many who gratefully remember him as singer, conductor, and composer during the closing decades of the nineteenth century. The story opens with his birth in Breslau in 1850, his work with Moscheles in Leipsic, and his early triumphs on the operatic stage. While still young he had won the admiration and friendship of the chief musicians of Germany, led by Joachim and Brahms. The great composer appears in these pages in a charming light, and Sir George speaks of him with affectionate gratitude and reverence. Despite his many friendships and ties in his own country, Henschel settled in England in early middle life, and, except for a spell of conducting in the United States, has remained with us ever since—to his own happiness and to the advantage of musical life and taste in London. He evidently possesses a gift for friendship as well as for music, and the delight with which he recalls his many distinguished friends communicates itself to the reader. In most volumes of this kind a good deal of chaff is mingled with the grain; but the book introduces us to men of whom we are always glad to hear, and to whom we owe gratitude for some of the purest joys of life.

* * *

Sir Edward Cook's "Literary Recreations" (Macmillan, 7s. 6d.) are at once scholarly and readable. The most authoritative of the essays is that on "The Art of Biography," a subject on which the biographer of Ruskin and Florence Nightingale has an incontestable claim to speak. "A Study in Superlatives" records the search for "the best" and "the greatest" in different departments of literature, and tells a curious and interesting story of literary verdicts, good, bad, and indifferent.

The longest of the essays is on "Second Thoughts of Poets," a really valuable collection of material enabling us to watch the authors at work, altering, adding, and polishing. In some cases a line which has won immortality, such as "A thing of beauty is a joy for ever," was a "second thought," in which the change of a couple of words makes the difference between poetry and prose. Sir Edward's love of good literature, his wide knowledge, and his steady judgment make his lightest work pleasant and instructive reading.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

This brilliant study of the emancipation of women written by Mr. Brimley Johnson ("The Women Novelists." By R. Brimley Johnson, Collins, Sons & Co., Ltd., 6s. net) and the development of their claims will be read with interest. From Mrs. Aphra Behn to Jane Austen, Fanny Burney, Charlotte Brontë, and George Eliot the progress in independence is remarkable. The criticisms on the writers are good and appreciative. The period when women's ideals were formed on those of men no longer exists. Dr. Johnson's influence is held to have spoilt "Camilla," and Dickens and Thackeray to have followed the feminine lead and bear witness to its influence. The higher ideal of morality is established. This change of ideals is very remarkable. The subserviency of women to masculine standards and the sacrifices made to the higher morality are illustrated from the writings of the "Great Four," who may justly claim to have laid the foundations of the English novel, if they did not actually invent it. The book is very interesting, and will repay perusal.

* * *

Except to those who, like the author, share his views, it is difficult to see to whom this sketch ("James Hinton: A Sketch," by Mrs. Havelock Ellis. Stanley Paul & Co., 10s. 6d.) of Mr. Hinton's work and aims will appeal. To the average man and woman it may be safely predicted that they will not. A doctor with a lucrative practice, he worked to "gain his freedom." His lectures and revolutionary suggestion on "sexual matters for the renovation of morals," and kindred subjects, advocating a "refined polygamy" as the cure of selfish monogamy, not unnaturally resulted in a tumour on the brain from which he died. The gist of his teaching was that "the true artist in life should desire to emerge into a finer sphere which is beyond morality, and reach in this way the higher liberty which needs no fixed commandments as it is a law in itself."

* * *

The Rev. J. P. Whitney is a well-known authority on mediæval history, and his small book entitled "The Second Century: Being a Series of Readings in Church History for Lent and Other Times" (S.P.C.K., 3s. 6d. net) will be studied with interest and profit. The readings aim "at giving a simple account of a period, sometimes supposed to be very difficult, sometimes very chaotic, and for both these reasons most neglected. I have tried to give the ordinary reader some information about the greater characters, the Christian literature and the Church life of the second century." So we come and walk and talk with St. John, St. Ignatius, St. Clement of Rome, St. Polycarp, St. Irenæus, St. Clement of Alexandria, Justin Martyr. The book is one to read and keep and read again.

THE CONGRESS OF PARIS.

AS I write, the Peace Conference has just completed its first month's work, the first draft of the constitution of the League of Nations has been laid before the assembled delegates, President Wilson has set sail for America with a copy of this draft in his pocket, Mr. George has returned to England, and Signor Orlando to Italy. This is therefore a good opportunity for stock-taking, for seeing how the Conference has done its work, the difficulties it has overcome, and the difficulties which lie ahead.

The machinery of the Conference is in appearance complicated and cumbrous. Demands for speeding up its work have been incessant, but none of the critics have put forward any practical or constructive proposal for the improvement of the machinery, and under the prevailing conditions it is not very easy to see how it can be improved. The Plenary Conference which meets in the great Clock Hall of the French Foreign Office is composed of sixty-six delegates from thirty States. Its proceedings are necessarily bi-lingual, every speech made in English being translated into French and every French speech into English. Obviously such a body is singularly ill-adapted for the rapid transaction of business. Therefore it meets but seldom, and its proceedings are almost wholly formal. The first task of the representatives of the five Great Powers who have constituted themselves a Committee of Management of the Conference was to reorganise its procedure in such a way as to reduce the necessity for debate and discussion at the Quai d'Orsay to a minimum, and to obtain general agreement on any particular question before it is presented to the Plenary Session. The real work of the Conference is, therefore, being done outside the Clock Hall. Twelve separate international committees have been constituted to deal with such matters as the Society of Nations, responsibility for the war, international Labour legislation, international waterways, reparation for war damage, international economic problems, and a variety of territorial questions. These committees are at work simultaneously, and report to an International Secretariat of the Conference, which prepares the business for the Plenary Session. All these committees were not created at once. The Plenary Session authorised the creation of eight at its meeting of January 25th, and the remaining four have been added since, while it is extremely probable that yet more will be needed. Having arranged for the committees to get to work, the representatives of the five Great Powers, who have become known as the "Council of Ten," undertook themselves, in order to expedite the dispatch of business, those less complicated questions which did not require reference to a special commission. These questions included the fate of the German colonies, the disposal of the territories conquered from Turkey, and preliminary investigation of the claims for the readjustment of their frontiers put forward by some of the smaller Powers, such as Greece, Serbia, Roumania, and Belgium. During the course of the month the Supreme War Council, commonly known as the "Versailles Coun-

cil," has met to deal with matters arising directly out of the operations of war by land and sea, such as the renewal of the Armistice, the fulfilment of the terms of the Armistice by our enemies, and the situation in Russia. It is obviously convenient that the Versailles Council, which through its permanent Secretariat has all the strings in its hands and is acquainted with the history of the events with which it deals, should continue this work rather than transfer its functions to the Peace Conference or to some new body created by it.

We have, then, at work in Paris at various times, as matters become ripe for consideration by the suitable authority, firstly the Plenary Conference, secondly the Committees of the Plenary Conference, thirdly the Council of Ten, and lastly the Supreme War Council. The Council of Ten would have avoided much criticism and made their task easier if they had explained their methods. At an early stage the waters were ruffled by a breeze, when the smaller Powers complained that the Council of Ten were arrogating to themselves too much authority. This arose from the discovery by the representatives of the smaller Powers that a seat at the table in the Clock Hall, to which great importance had been attached when the preliminaries of the Conference were being arranged, was more honorific than useful, and that a place in the Committee Rooms was of much greater value. The difficulty was amicably settled by allowing the smaller Powers increased representation in Committee and by getting them to settle among themselves how representation should be distributed. The second attack made upon the Ten was originated by the opponents of the League of Nations, who, while prepared to accept the League as a harmless ideal, desired a prompt settlement with Germany on the traditional lines which the victors of the past have followed in dealing with the vanquished. The popular sentiment in favour of "getting on with the Peace," and the natural desire of all who have suffered in or by the war to see the chief criminal brought to prompt punishment, the public impatience for definite results, and the difficulty of following the daily work of the various commissions and committees which appeared to jump from Europe to Asia and thence to Africa without rhyme or reason, were all skilfully used by these gentlemen, and for some time, particularly in France, the Conference had a bad Press. These are forces which are still at work, and it is more than probable that the cry of "Get on with the Peace" will again be raised in the same quarter before the Conference concludes its work. It is for this reason that I have been at some pains to explain how the Conference is organised. This organisation, if not perfect, is at least honestly designed to facilitate the effective establishment of a League of Nations; and all the arguments and discussions which it has aroused bring us back sooner or later to the one vital question—is the League to be the foundation of or an appendage to the Peace? If it is to be the foundation, then the settlement with Germany must await the acceptance of its principles.

The events which preceded the assembly of the Conference were

not of the best augury. M. Clemenceau made a speech which appeared to favour a re-establishment of the Balance of Power, and stated plainly his doubt whether France would in any other way get the security which was vital to her; in America President Wilson had suffered an electoral reverse, and his plans for the League of Nations were freely criticised as vague and impracticable; in Italy, where there had been a wave of chauvinism, Signor Bissolati, the most able and influential of the Italian champions of the League, had been hooted in Milan. Only in Great Britain were President Wilson's ideals supported by any great weight of public opinion, and this support had been weakened by doubts and anxieties as to what he meant by "the Freedom of the Seas." It is important to remember this if we are to appreciate how much has been accomplished in the first four weeks. I attribute the change of tone which became apparent very soon after the delegates had assembled, first to the influence of President Wilson's tour of Europe, secondly to the unity of Anglo-Saxon opinion, and thirdly to the general atmosphere of good will and to the readiness of all in authority to make concessions for the common good. The immediate acceptance by the people of every country which President Wilson visited of the fact that he represented a new order of ideas, and the conviction, to which his visits gave stimulus and expression, that a new order of ideas must go to the repairing of the old world, had great effect in Paris. This effect was enhanced by the early realisation by the American contingent, delegates, officials, and journalists, of our sincerity of purpose, of our real will to make sacrifices in the interests of the world's peace. The consequence of this was the formation of a solid block of Anglo-American opinion, which naturally commands great respect. In what I have already said and in what I have yet to say there are and will be references to differences of view. These differences should be recognised and met in time, for unless the Peace which is to be, and the League which is in the making, are supported by an enthusiastic and unanimous public opinion in the countries of the Allied and Associated Powers, neither will give us the solution for which the world is craving. I do not, however, wish to exaggerate these differences, which are more apparent outside than within the Council Chambers. If neglected they may become formidable, but up to the present the most striking and satisfactory feature in the work of the Conference has been the ease with which difficulties have been overcome, when once those whose views are not wholly in agreement have been brought together.

For all these reasons the Conference opened on January 18th in a much more promising atmosphere than had at one time seemed probable. The week which followed was the most critical in the development of the League of Nations. Those who were eager for an immediate settlement with Germany did not in the least object to the League receiving a general benison from the Conference. They hoped that it would then be referred to a committee from which it would emerge at a later stage after what they regarded

as the real business had been settled. During this week President Wilson established his name in Europe as a man of affairs. Those who had regarded him as an amiable and high-minded philosopher now found to their surprise that his unshakable faith in his principles, his skill in applying those principles to specific problems, his unfailing good humour and tact in reconciling opposite views, his power of getting complicated business through committee, marked him as an administrator and a man of affairs of the first rank. Before the second Plenary Session he had, with the cordial support of our delegates, won his point. The League of Nations was to be the foundation of the peace, and January 25th may be marked as its birthday.

On that day the full Conference passed the three following resolutions:—

1. It is essential to the maintenance of the world settlement which the Associated Nations are now to establish, that a League of Nations should be established to promote international co-operation, to ensure the fulfilment of international obligations, and to provide safeguards against war.

2. This League should be created as an integral part of the general Treaty of Peace, and should be open to every civilised nation which can be relied upon to promote its objects.

3. The members of the League should meet periodically, and should have a permanent organisation and secretariat to carry on the business of the League in the intervals between the conferences.

The spirit of these resolutions was immediately reflected in the establishment of a number of committees which the Conference authorised the same day, to examine and report upon international problems. The more important of these committees will continue the processes of removing and smoothing over the difficulties of international administration for a common purpose which have been gradually built up by the Allied and associated Powers during the war. Their object in the future will be less the removal of a common danger and more the promotion of a common good. They will, if they are effective—and there is no reason for supposing that they will not be effective—of themselves obviate most of the causes of friction and the clash of interests which have sown the seeds of past wars; they will take the place of much of the old cumbrous machinery of diplomacy, and will bring into direct touch those who in each country are charged with like problems of administration. These decisions have the effect of clearing wide roads for international communication, which has hitherto been confined to the narrow and tortuous channels of the Foreign Offices of Europe.

The resolutions of January 25th then marked a vital stage in the efforts to remove the causes of war, but they deal in the main with the future, and to-day most of the peoples of the Old World are concerned with very present and practical difficulties. The Allied Armies in Europe and in Asia are in occupation of large stretches of conquered territory, and territory means much to a generation which has been brought up to regard the annexation of provinces as the hall-mark of victory,

and to watch anxiously and suspiciously for designs in each nation upon its neighbours' landmarks. It was broadly hinted that noble aspirations and vague generalities might have no specific application, but that the occupation by Great Britain of the majority of the German colonies and of a great part of Asiatic Turkey was a reality, as was also the fact that the frontiers of the Balkan Powers and of the new republics of Eastern and South-Eastern Europe were undefined, and that each wanted something which was in the hands of a neighbour. If the principles of the League of Nations were to be applied to the resettlement of the world it was necessary to give a prompt example of their application to some particular problem. The chance arose when the disposal of the German colonies, which was taken in hand by the Council of Ten during the last week of January, came to be considered.

We may be proud of the fact that it was our delegation, under the leadership of the Prime Minister, which set the example. After some opposition from Mr. Hughes, which was magnified quite unwarrantably into a definite and serious conflict of opinion, the application of the mandatory principle to the German colonies was unanimously accepted. French opinion was at first far from cordial in its reception of this news, mainly because the conception of a mandate for the administration of territory was new and its meaning was not understood. Our French friends, with bitter recollections of difficulties in Egypt, in the Congo, and in Morocco, were very naturally and rightly hostile to the suggestion that the League of Nations or some supra-national authority should undertake the business of government. Nothing of the kind was ever intended. The proposal is that territories which have been conquered from the enemy, and are inhabited by peoples who are not yet able to govern themselves efficiently, shall be administered in every case by one Power selected by the League as best fitted by reason of its resources, experience, and geographical position to receive its mandate to govern the territory in the interests of the inhabitants. For all the more backward territories, the League will draw up rules for the guidance of its mandatories, so as to insure uniformity of administration in such matters as freedom of conscience or religion, the prevention of such abuses as the slave trade, the arms and liquor traffic, the prohibition of the creation of naval or military bases or of native military forces, except such as are necessary for police purposes. In all territories held under the mandate of the League there will be equal opportunities for the trade and commerce of all its members; none of them may be exploited in the interests of the mandatory Power. While it may be taken as certain that the mandatory principle will be applied without exception to all the German colonies, its application to the territories conquered from Turkey has yet to be settled, and here there are still difficulties to be overcome. The mandate for most of the German colonies will naturally fall to us and to our Dominions, and our responsibilities are already likely to be so great that there is no desire to increase them. France, Italy, and Greece have claims and interests in Asia Minor, while France has historic

and commercial associations with Syria. The position is further complicated by the existence of various secret treaties and agreements, made during the course of the war with little or no regard for the wishes and aspirations of the peoples concerned, while these wishes are sometimes conflicting. The Arabs, for example, are not friendly to the idea of a French administration of Damascus, and would prefer our tutelage, but this would unquestionably arouse the suspicion and jealousy of the French, whom the inhabitants of Beyrout and of the Lebanon desire to have as their tutors. The acceptance of the mandatory principle does not therefore cut the Gordian knot, and the problem of Asiatic Turkey still requires tactful and careful handling. The difficulties will be much eased and possible causes of friction avoided if America can be induced to accept a mandate and to employ a part of her vast resources in the cause of civilisation outside the American continent. The Old World is on the verge of bankruptcy, and without America's practical help the new methods of government will not start under favourable conditions. Unless they have adequate financial backing the trustees will not be in a position to develop the estates they administer in the interests of their wards. This is a proposal which has not so far been very warmly received in the United States, where there is a natural aversion to anything savouring of interference with the politics of the Old World, and to undertaking an experiment in administration for which there is neither precedent nor experience. Much, therefore, remains to do before even the extra-European territorial problems are resolved, yet the acceptance of the mandatory principle gave at once a reality to the League of Nations which before was lacking, and the effect of this was immediate. It was at once seen that the Congress of Paris was in earnest in its intention to apply new principles to the drafting of the terms of peace, and that the mere fact of possession would cease to have the weight it used to carry with the old diplomacy. A warning issued by the Great Powers, that the process of claim-jumping and land-grabbing which had been going on in Eastern Europe since the Armistice was first signed must cease, was promptly respected. The Czecho-Slovaks and the Poles began to compose their differences, while Italy, Roumania, and the Jugo-Slavs agreed to await the decision of the Conference as to their future frontiers, and the atmosphere was immediately cleared.

All these questions, grave as they are, become secondary in comparison with the problems of the future of Russia and of Germany. These are the tests by which the decision to make the League of Nations the foundation of the Peace will stand or fall. The atmosphere of Paris is not altogether conducive to calm judgment and cool decision. France is to-day quite naturally dominated by the sense of escape from an appalling disaster, and is just beginning to realise that she is free after living for close on fifty years under the perpetual menace of invasion. The stream of criticism which has poured from the Paris Press almost without intermission since the Conference opened is the expression of this emotion. The daily demand is for security, for immediate settlement with

Germany, for the restoration of order in Russia. If we are to carry France with us we must appreciate her point of view. For years after 1871 she lived under the sense of her isolation and weakness in face of the Central Powers. Then the Russian Alliance came to her as the means of salvation and of restoration to her old position in Europe. In gratitude she poured her millions into Russia, and when the great trial came Russia proved a broken reed. Half the *bourgeoisie* of Paris have some part of their savings invested in Russian funds. To-day the chief thought in the mind of the average Frenchman is that France with her forty millions of population will have seventy-five millions of Germans as neighbours, and that there will be no effective counterpoise in Eastern Europe. The howl which greeted the issue of the invitation to the Prinkipo Conference was a *cri du cœur* rather than an expression of reasoned opinion. It was taken as an official recognition of Bolshevism, and the idea of parleying with the wreckers of their hopes was abhorrent. The Council of Ten have themselves to thank for most of the criticism which the Prinkipo Conference has aroused, because they vouchsafed no explanation of their objects and intentions. Now that explanations have been given the proposal is being examined more judicially. Even in France the practical difficulties in the way of armed intervention are accepted. Personally I am convinced that if it were practicable it would be a gross blunder. All the most reliable evidence is to the effect that the military power of Bolshevism is on the decline. The peasants are growing daily more and more weary of disorder and mob rule. The Bolshevik Government is less and less able to feed them, and its influence is proportionately diminishing. The one measure that would rally its adherents would be to give it the occasion for raising the cry that the Allies were interfering with the sovereignty of the Russian people and its right of self-determination. The possible courses are to confer, to do nothing, or to endeavour to isolate Bolshevism. It is by no means certain that the Prinkipo Conference will be held, because the Powers have insisted that before it assembles all hostilities in Russia shall cease, and that the various Russian Governments shall send delegations. Neither of these conditions has yet been fulfilled. Should the Conference not be held, or fail to produce any practical result, there remains the alternative of assisting the anti-Bolshevik Governments in Russia to establish order in their own districts on condition that they adopt a defensive attitude towards Bolshevik Russia. This is the policy of forming a "Sanitary Cordon" round Bolshevism. Whether it is practicable or not depends upon the agreement of the anti-Bolshevik Governments to act in unity in accordance with a policy defined by the Great Powers, and it is by no means certain that without some such measure as the Prinkipo Conference such agreement can be obtained. There the Russian problem at present rests. There is no need to emphasise its difficulties, and of all the questions which the Conference has attempted to tackle this is the one with which least progress has been made.

The other outstanding difficulty is to convince France that she

will find in the League of Nations the security for which she asks, and that she will get it in no other way. Every Frenchman alive to-day has been brought up to look for security in military force and in a strategic frontier. His one desire at the moment is to avoid all danger of his beloved country again becoming the cockpit of Europe. The advantages to be gained by removing the causes of war by means of international agreements upon questions where the interests of nations clash or overlap appear to him to be vague and remote. He has not naturally the sea-sense, and does not readily appreciate the immense power which an economic blockade, backed by overwhelming force at sea, will confer upon the League of Nations. He doubts the efficacy of the moral deterrent which a general agreement among the members of the League to exercise force in support of its decisions would afford. He wants the League to have at its disposal an adequate military force ready to strike at a moment's notice—in other words, an international army under supra-national control. This strikes at the root-principle upon which the constitution of the League has been drafted. That constitution has been deliberately planned so as to interfere as little as may be with the sovereign rights of the States which will constitute the League. It is a constitution which does not pretend to be final or complete, but is capable of improvement and development as experience in its working is gained. President Wilson made this quite clear in his speech on February 14th introducing the constitution to the Congress. "Armed force is in the background of the programme, but it is in the background, and if the moral force of the world will not suffice the physical force of the world shall. But this is the last resort, because this is intended as a constitution of peace, not as a league of war. The simplicity of the document seems to me to be one of its chief virtues, because, speaking for myself, I was unable to foresee the variety of circumstances with which the League would have to deal. I was unable, therefore, to plan all the machinery which might be necessary to meet differing and unexpected contingencies. Therefore I should say of this document that it is not a straight-jacket but a vehicle of life."

The draft constitution of the League has been placed before the delegates for their consideration and criticism. So far criticism in France has fastened upon those articles which deal with armaments and with the exercise of force in support of the decisions of the League. It may be possible to strengthen those clauses and to give the League power and authority to carry out inspection of naval and military establishments, so that it may receive timely warning of the preparations of any Power to endanger the peace of the world. I believe, however, that public opinion in France is moving much more rapidly towards acceptance of the principles laid down in the draft constitution than is indicated by the tone of the Paris Press. Frenchmen are coming round more and more to the view put before them by President Wilson when he spoke in the Chamber of Deputies on February 3rd, that under any other solution France will inevitably be crushed by the burden of armaments, and that "... the sacrifices which may be demanded under

the League are as nothing to those which would be required without it." The truth is that no solution on the old lines can make France safe. A strategic frontier on the Rhine or beyond it will not alter the fact that on one side of the frontier there are seventy-five million Germans and on the other forty million Frenchmen. How useless in these circumstances any arbitrary arrangement of a frontier line must be has been well illustrated by a controversy which has been agitating France for the last fortnight. Accusations have been made that the famous ironfields of Briey, which fell into the hands of the Germans in the early days of the war, were not bombarded, and that no attempt was made to recover them, because of the pressure which the owners of the mines exercised on the French Government. This is a matter of French domestic politics which does not concern us, but during one of the several debates on the matter in the French Chamber M. Viviani, the French Prime Minister at the outbreak of war, stated that the French Government had at the end of July, 1914, ordered all French troops to be withdrawn ten kilometres from the frontier in order to avoid any incident which Germany might translate into an act of aggression, and to make clear to the world the sincerity of France's desire to keep peace. M. Viviani might have added, that express orders were also issued that no French troops were to enter Belgian or Swiss territory, and that no flying was to take place over these territories. These orders do honour to the French Government, but they unquestionably conferred an enormous advantage upon Germany, in that they gave her time to conceal her preparations for attack, and enabled her to effect a great military surprise. No military frontier can confer defensive advantages if it is treated in that way. Yet one may anticipate, and, indeed, hope, that any democratic Power sincerely anxious to avoid war will, when confronted by the danger of aggression, behave as France behaved in 1914. It is not in that direction that security lies.

The Conference has in the past paid too little attention to the feelings of France on this matter of security, and one of the consequences of this neglect was the outburst of exaggeration of Germany's powers of resistance to the will of the Allies which preceded the recent renewal of the Armistice. The question of this renewal ought long ago to have been considered in connection with the whole work of the Conference. This is now being done, and by the time this article is in the hands of my readers it may be expected that Germany will have been required to proceed with her demobilisation down to a scale which, while allowing her sufficient force for the maintenance of internal order, will convince France that any resistance by armed force to the terms which the Conference at Paris decides to impose is absolutely impossible. Germany will, in fact, be required to lead the way in disarmament as she led it in armament. I anticipate that when these results are obtained France will approach the League of Nations in a calmer and more friendly spirit, and will recognise it not as an enunciation of vague principles and high ideals, but as the only practical solution which has yet been advanced of the world-problem of to-day, and as a real "covenant of fraternity and friendship."

THE EUROPEAN FAMINE.

THE prophets of the present war have always assured us that the close of it would bring about a "New World," and certainly they seem to be keeping their promise. Even in England, most stable and solid of nations, the signs are present. A public debt fantastic in its monstrosity; social unrest, chronic grousing in the Army; over a thousand honest citizens in jail; machine guns and tanks in the streets of Glasgow; and, to deal with it all, a House of Commons which—not to speak unkindly—reminds one of the Abomination of Desolation, it is so obviously sitting where it ought not.

But it is abroad that the New World created by the war shows itself most vividly. For the victors it is, I fear, a world of disillusion, for the conquered a world of chaos, and for all alike a world on the brink of famine. Of course hunger is a matter of degree: it does not kill in so many seconds, like prussic acid. And one sometimes sees newspaper readers, accustomed to the more full-blooded horrors of the battlefield, a little disappointed to find that a much-advertised famine is only reckoned in terms of a doubled child death-rate from measles, scarlatina, and diphtheria, a trebled rate for tuberculosis and the like. But they need not really be disappointed. The calculations furnished to Mr. Hoover and Lord Robert Cecil last autumn anticipated possibly 20,000,000 deaths during the winter in Russia alone, and there seems to be no reason so far to believe that they were exaggerated.

It is impossible to take in figures like these. The best method is to begin by considering the sort of case that is not uncommon in an ordinary Englishman's experience, where a child which ought to be well-grown and healthy sinks into permanent ill-health and uselessness because its mother cannot buy milk for it; to take one such case in one's own knowledge, and then multiply and intensify. But it is well also to know what the extreme can be, both in misery and—if such words are forgivable—in the power of man to ennoble misery. A friend of mine who had been administering relief in Central Russia told me that some refugee children had arrived at his camp in the care of one woman, who died soon after arrival. They were the remnants of a party of about eighty refugees from the Polish front, who had walked away eastward with their stock of food ever diminishing, until at last the oldest man of the party made a resolution. He prayed for a time alone; then called the other men and asked them to pray with him, because he had a proposal to make. Then he proposed that they, the men, should eat nothing more but leave the food for the women and children, and the men agreed. When the men had all died the grown women made the same resolution; and, as a result, a small scattering of children came alive to Samara and were saved.

Let us try to form some conception of the size of the famine problem. The American Federal Food Board, towards the end of

1918, made a summary of the immediate task lying before it. It had:—

(1) To help in the provisioning of France, England, and Italy, approximately some 125 million people;

(2) To furnish the greater part of the food necessary for the Belgians, Serbs, Roumanians, Greeks, Czechs, Yugo-Slavs, in all about 75 million;

(3) To do their best for some 50 million people in North Russia in conditions of acute famine owing to the collapse of transport and the lack of organised government;

(4) To help the neutral states of Europe, who are all, except Denmark, on short rations;

(5) To assist the enemy peoples, some 90 millions, to secure for themselves the food necessary to support life.

It is not an easy programme! Of course there are, as we said above, degrees in food-shortage. For example, Holland is suffering from what may be called severe hardship, but not starvation. Her rations of food have now been increased, though not in respect of fats, which were badly needed. Of coal there is a real dearth, which however is less felt than it might have been because Dutch manufactures have already been brought to a stop by the lack of raw materials. Some of these will presumably recover; others, like the margarine industry, have been captured by other countries during the war. On the other hand, Dutch agriculture will gain by a supply of cheap nitrates, which England imported to make explosives during the war and is now selling off. (*The Times*, February 3rd.)

In Italy the famine conditions seem to be locally very severe. From Foggia and Basilicata the distress is almost on an East-European standard. A Government commissioner in November reported 85 per cent. of the population ill, no fuel and little food, and the ravages of such diseases as influenza reaching unheard-of proportions.

In Serbia, according to a well-informed writer in *The Springfield Republican*, the population is said to be reduced by 50 per cent.; in Poland a vastly larger population by 25 per cent. I was assured two years ago by a good witness that in large regions of Poland no child under seven was left alive. This is a completely different state of affairs from Belgium, for instance, where the population, though suffering hardship, has been kept intact by British and American support.

Hungary seems to have food; but most of the accounts of the nations of the late Austrian Empire are deplorable. "Since we have entered Austria there is no food to be had at any price," is the report of one of the members of an English Relief Commission. Colonel Summerhaves, Chief of the British Red Cross Mission to Prisoners, wrote from Vienna that people were "dying like flies." During fifteen years in India he had never witnessed such sights. Children, half-dead with hunger, had to be wrapped in rags and paper, in the lack of proper clothes. Some hospitals were closed, because all the patients were dead. (*The Times*, December 23rd.) This ghastly state of things was made worse

by the hostile action of the Czechs and Poles, eventually put a stop to by the order of the Peace Conference. The disorder in great parts of the former Austrian territory amounts to anarchy. Trains cannot run for fear of the bands of robbers.

A more ordinary degree of dreadfulness is presented by the conditions in Germany and in the parts of Northern France recently in German occupation. Careful medical reports have been drawn up by Professor Calmette for Lille, and by various German commissions for parts of Germany. In Lille the general mortality, from about 19 to 21 per thousand before the war, rose in 1918 to 41.5; that is, it was doubled. The diseases chiefly responsible were tuberculosis, heart disease, dysentery and scurvy, all of them provoked by insufficient nutrition. The infant mortality, however, did not increase; it actually diminished from 18.4 to about 16; a strange fact, due to a most strange cause. Industrial work being almost entirely suppressed, the married women stayed at home and nursed their own babies; and their malnutrition under German rule proved less damaging to the infants than their normal peace-time work in French factories! I wonder what conclusions the French Socialists will draw from that.

In Lille, then, the death-rate was doubled. In Germany as a whole it was nothing approaching this, though probably in particular towns the rate could be paralleled. There are careful reports by Dr. Hamel, medical expert to the Ministry of the Interior, by Dr. Rubel, of whom I know nothing, and by a great Medical Conference of 3,000 doctors in Berlin. The figures appear to be consistent with our other evidence, and not to be in any sense "faked," though doubtless they are trumpeted to the world with a certain amount of organised publicity.

The Imperial German Government naturally tried—as all Governments would—to keep its people in heart by minimising the food difficulty. It professed to the end that the public health was good, and that conditions were sure to improve. Also, the pressure of food-shortage seems not to have been very severely felt till the middle of 1916. By 1917 the mortality among civilians had increased 32 per cent., and by 1918 37 per cent. The progressive increase is evidence of the progressive devitalisation of the whole community. A curious confirmation of this is to be found in some of the issues of paper money by German municipalities; in the earlier part of the war they are not particularly different from other such notes, but by the autumn of 1917 they are sometimes openly rebellious and "défaitiste," bearing such devices as a rotten turnip for their municipal emblem, and mottoes contrasting war and famine with peace and a decent life. Specimens may be seen in the War Museum.

The child mortality in Germany was much greater than in Lille. The German women evidently were kept at their factory work. For children under five it increased by 50 per cent., between five and fifteen by 55 per cent. And in particular areas it must have been terrible. In Solingen, for instance, according to Mr. Nevinson, the Medical Officer reports a doubling and trebling of certain large classes of disease and death.

After the Armistice there was a brief struggle by certain farmers and holders of foodstuffs in England and America to break down the International Control and sell their wares to starving Europe for the best price obtainable. (Was there not once a few in the Middle Ages who sold a bushel of wheat for a bushel of gold? And, though he was apparently torn into small pieces very shortly afterwards, that part of the programme could easily be dropped.) However, the absolute necessity for continuing the control asserted itself, and this dangerous attempt at "profiteering" passed. Mr. Hoover wrote an appeal which was read, I believe, in all the Churches of the United States on December 2nd, 1918, asking for "renewed service and sacrifice":—

"The freeing of the seas from the submarine menace renders accessible the wheat supplies of India, Australia, and the Argentine. The total food demand upon the United States, however, is not diminished. On the contrary, it is increased. In addition to supplying those to whom we are already pledged, we now have the splendid opportunity and obligation of meeting the needs of those millions of people in the hitherto occupied territories who are facing actual starvation. The people of Belgium, Northern France, Serbia, Roumania, Montenegro, Poland, Russia, and Armenia rely upon America for immediate aid.

"We must also participate in the preservation of the newly liberated nations of Austria; nor can we ignore the effects on the future world-development of a famine condition among those other people whom we have recently released from our enemies. . . .

"America has established the foundations of Government by the People throughout the enemy countries, and this is the real bulwark of world peace. We have yet to build on these foundations. No Government or nation can stand if its people are starving. We must do our part if the world is not to be consumed in a flame of anarchy."

An extra 200,000,000 people, he calculated, were now asking America for food.

This magnificent work, though oddly interrupted at the beginning by some unexplained obstructions, has been on the whole taken in hand with vigour. New Food Missions have been established in centres hitherto inaccessible; one in Poland, one in Trieste for the supply of its vast hinterland, another in Bucharest, another in Smyrna or Alexandretta. An attempt has been made to meet the acute needs of Vienna. The feeding of Russia, apparently, is still an insoluble problem, except in a few of the most accessible districts.

As to the actual amount of food available, I can get no clear information beyond the valuable forecasts made by Sir George Paish. Mr. Hoover appears to think that if carefully used and well distributed there is enough to last till next harvest; by that time, according to Mr. Weyl in the *New Republic*, there will actually be a glut of wheat. Even of the present supply, he assures us, a surplus of 260 million bushels remained unsold in America on January 4th.

The order in which the various nations should be arranged in

the food queue, so to speak, is given by Mr. Hoover's message and by the list above on p. 251. It is well put in the *New York Times* of December 3rd:—

"The Allies have been fighting for civilisation, an enlightened humane civilisation; but how can it be so hailed, now that victory is won, if millions, no matter where, gathered into communities, are permitted to die of starvation? Our peace must not be stained with unforgettable inhumanity. . . . Our love runs towards the peoples of Belgium, Northern France, Serbia, Roumania, Montenegro, Poland, Armenia, and Russia; our duty requires us to supply the deficiencies in food of those countries whose soldiers were lately in arms against us."

I trust that the fine spirit of this statement does not smack too much of the Old World and the old religion to be acceptable to the New.

Austria and Turkey are being fed. Their populations are, luckily for themselves, able to certify themselves as oppressed nationalities who were forced to support our enemies against their will. Even Bulgaria has been receiving relief. It is only about Germany that the Allied policy seems inconsistent and ambiguous. Germany, it will be observed, comes last in the queue on several grounds. She is last if friends come before enemies; she is last if the great need comes before the lesser need. But she has her place in the queue all the same.

In the terms of the Armistice, Clause 26, we promised to allow food into Germany, and specifically to relax the blockade. On November 11th President Wilson announced to Congress that everything possible would be done to provide the peoples of the Central Empires with food "and relieve the distressing want that is in so many places threatening their very lives." Mr. Lansing repeated this as a promise on November 12th. Marshal Foch and Sir W. Beveridge's Commission about the same time announced that "in Prussia and Austria especially the population is in a state bordering on famine." Mr. Hoover about the same time explained that the feeding of Germany, though urgent, was not a matter of sending relief. It was only a matter of "relaxing the water-tight blockade," "so that the Germans may secure for themselves the bare necessities that will give them a chance of establishing stable government."

Thus, either food was to be sent immediately, or the blockade was to be relaxed. For months, no food appears to have been sent. There are many complaints in Germany, backed up by appeals from neutral countries. For example, the great Swedish Pro-Ally Mr. Branting telegraphed an appeal to M. Albert Thomas. The Danish *Politiken* wrote passionate articles; the Pope issued an intercession. On January 26th the *Daily Chronicle* says that the delay in sending food is due to the "absence of proper organisation" at the disposal of the Food Commission. But this does not appear to have been the whole reason.

Meantime the blockade, instead of being relaxed, was made far stricter. For one thing, it was extended to the Baltic. No imports

were allowed into the German Baltic coast towns, and no exports from them, such as had continued all through the war to Sweden, Norway, and Finland. Then the coastal trade from one German port to another was stopped. Next all traffic across the Rhine was barred, a quite new restriction, which at once plunged the populations of the right bank into acute distress, as the people depended on the left bank for farm produce and the factories for raw material. At the same time the requisition of enormous quantities of rolling stock and of agricultural implements, to replace those plundered from Belgium and France, sent the wave of distress reverberating all through the interior of Germany. Some of the more excitable German newspapers seem, naturally enough, to have jumped to the conclusion that their enemies, now having them by the throat, meant finally and triumphantly to starve them to death.

This intention apparently was rather too "New World" in its character to be entertained by responsible people. But Dr. Dillon, in the *Daily Telegraph* of February 10th, attributes something rather like it to certain "men of mark" in France. Germany, they contend, has temporarily recovered from her Bolshevik fever; but by prolonged unemployment combined with starvation it may be hoped that the fever will be redoubled. "By April the sinister consequences of this stagnation will have taken the form of revolts, rebellions, disintegration. This conjuncture will be the opportunity of the Entente Powers . . ." who can then make, and obtain, any demand they like.

This is the fantastic side of New World politics. But there is or has been a real divergence of practical opinion, one side being largely represented by America and the other by France. The former argued that "the first object of the Allies ought to be to save Germany from Bolshevism by suppressing the blockade and sending in large supplies." (*Daily Telegraph*, February 2nd.) The other view is represented by the *Echo de Paris* of December 24th: "If a state of order exists in Germany, her influence over Russia will be strengthened. If order is absent, the revolutionary wave will be encouraged" and may spread towards France. It is very embarrassing. As one of the German papers modestly observes, a large corpse in the centre of Europe will have, even to the Entente Powers, its inconveniences! The *Echo de Paris* concludes that "The best course is to keep Germany equally removed from political health and disease by dosing her and controlling her food supply"; but it seems to have written "disease" in mistake for "death." Disease is what it desires to produce, but not absolutely fatal disease.

The notion that Germany may suddenly declare war again and produce from the blue a new army, new war material, new food supplies and the rest, like the similar notion that the Spartacist risings in Berlin and elsewhere were all "camouflage" got up by Hindenburg, is of course so much midsummer madness, the fruit partly of deliberate humbug, partly of shattered nerves and exasperated emotions. It breaks out from time to time in the forcing-house atmosphere of Paris. All the passions of war are

stronger among the French than with us, and very naturally and excusably so. We have not been through their long agonies of fear, we have not suffered their frightful material wrongs. We must, as loyal Allies, be both respectful and considerate in our attitude towards them; but one of the most important services we can render them is to keep our own nerves comparatively steady.

This is not merely a matter of preserving ourselves by preventing the spread of Bolshevism to the westward. There is that element in it; for misery pushed beyond a certain point leaves men only one hope in life, the hope of getting some revenge before they die. And, as we have seen already in this war, that sort of misery is infectious as the Plague. But it is not only or mainly a matter of checking Bolshevism. I do not pretend to understand all the giddy heights of New World patriotism; that virtue has a tendency to become pathological; but I do not believe that one ordinary sane Englishman in a thousand really likes to think that the children of his enemies are "dying like flies," or living "in an apathy of feebleness with starved bodies and silent ape-like faces." I believe that our wish is to help them instantly. The Americans out of their abundance have given with splendid generosity; the Swiss out of their meagre and stinted rations have given with a diligent self-sacrifice that is almost more splendid still. I do not believe that we British are less generous than either the Swiss or the Americans.

My object in writing this article, from such imperfect sources of information as were open to me, is to call attention to the actual need of food that still continues among all the peoples of Central and Eastern Europe; to help in warning public opinion here that the time for easy food conditions has not come and is not yet near; and lastly, for whatever such an assurance may be worth, to assure the Government that if they do ever feel it right to ask us to exercise a little more self-denial in the matter of food for the sake of nations whose need is greater, I do not believe they will encounter any formidable opposition, and I know they will have a considerable body of enthusiastic support.

GILBERT MURRAY.

THE INDUSTRIAL FUTURE.

LABOUR troubles after the war were expected and predicted by so many people that few can have been surprised by the number which have actually taken place, though the anarchic element has been more prominent than many expected. Some people, indeed, are relieved to find that the strikes are after all, in the main, trade disputes of the old kind, even the "sympathetic" motive being nothing new, although there is some novelty in the principle of striking for shorter hours in order to create employment for outsiders.

Employers are naturally disquieted at concurrent demands for shorter hours and higher wages, apparently made without regard to the necessity of competing with the production of other countries where wages may be much lower and working hours much longer; and it is over this test that a critical situation may be created later. For the time being, high wages in a number of industries are maintained by the high prices which everyone still expects to pay, the workers themselves being among the purchasers. The real test will come when industry everywhere gravitates to normal peace conditions, and international competition is resumed, with Germany in the field. And the elements of a crisis will consist, on the one hand, in the confident assumption of many employers that industry can be sustained by fiscal or other measures to exclude competitive imports, and, on the other, in the now common belief among workers that the enormous sums raised for war loans represent an actual product of past labour.

Already, it would seem, protective measures are in course of preparation, and indeed in actual operation. Publishers are not allowed to import paper, on the ground that employment must be maintained for our own paper-makers. The economic ideas thus acted upon by the Paper Controller are closely akin to those of the workmen who smashed machinery in the early stages of its introduction in the last century. Sir Albert Stanley, too, is reported as announcing, by way of reassuring a deputation of protectionists, that those restrictions on imports which have latterly been removed will be reimposed, and that no other restrictions will be removed save with the approval of the traders supposed to be specially interested. Thus, while all eyes are bent on the Peace Conference and the labour troubles at home and elsewhere, a protectionist system of the crudest description is being imposed by the Board of Trade, without any process of legislation whatever.

The primitive fallacy which underlies the procedure in question will soon reveal itself to intelligent people in respect of the results. The idea of the departmental authorities is that employment will be maximised by keeping out foreign goods—the elementary delusion of the protectionist of all ages. Now, the high figures of unemployment in our industrial history coincide not with high but with relatively low figures of imports. While an abnormal home demand subsists for ships, machinery, and textiles, employment in these industries may be continued, in despite of the high prices maintained in other industries by protection. But, once

more, when the world settles down to its normal life of industrial competition, the existence of relatively high prices in this country will be incompatible with a successful export trade, unless the manufacturers are to sell dear at home and cheap abroad, in the customary protectionist fashion. But in a country which, like Britain, imports most of its raw material, this course will be rapidly ruinous, since the price of the exports determines the amount of the material imported. Meanwhile, the high home prices secured by the manufacturer will give further occasion for demands for increased wages and reduced working hours. Industry will thus move in a vicious circle, while such a competitor as Japan, to say nothing of a Germany that is likely to have adopted Free Trade, will gain foreign export trade at Britain's expense.

Even before trade reaches normal conditions, probably, the effect of the unintelligent restrictions on imports will be revealed in persistent unemployment. All those exclusions of foreign manufactures in order to make work at home have the immediate effect of preventing work by others. The paper which is being excluded would, if imported, mean employment for others than paper-makers; and the increase of productivity on that side would stimulate demand for home-made paper. The nation will simply have to learn once more, by painful experience, the elementary truths which are being flouted by a new set of officials in whose training political economy played no part.

If, as is so lamentably probable, unemployment is thus positively increased by protectionist action, we may expect to see a continuous application of the new trade union principle that unemployment is to be secured by the systematic reduction of working hours. The late Robert Scott Moffatt long ago advised the workers to meet a reduction of wages not by striking but by simply reducing working hours. But that advice, right or wrong, was given with an eye to falls in prices resulting from relative over-production, the idea being that restriction of output was the natural remedy. The new idea does not appear to be of that order. The assumption is simply that when for any reason there is a given amount of employment, insufficient for all the hands wanting work at the present length of working day, the working day must be shortened accordingly. And if prices are being artificially forced up by the State at the request of the manufacturers, the workers will have every right and every incitement to demand that all their numbers shall be thus provided for. The manufacturers will be stimulating the very developments of which they are most afraid.

If some reports are true, indeed, some masters have already provoked such developments by non-fulfilment of their pledges to employees who enlisted at the outbreak of the war. Such men were in most cases promised restoration to their posts when the war was over. In certain cases, according to reports which have reached the present writer, employers announce that men who have been away from work for four-and-a-half years are relatively inefficient when they return, and therefore cannot profitably be employed. If this has happened at all frequently, there is nothing

surprising in a determination among workers in general to force the employment of all by a systematic reduction of working hours.

And there is further, as Lord Leverhulme so insistently reminds us, a very strong case for the reduction of hours of labour. It is the strain of toil that primarily sets up "labour unrest"; and workers who for four years have been working more or less exceptionally hard naturally look for an easier life in peace. In modern industry, improvement in organisation and economy generally means a heightening of pace and continuity of effort. If there is not compensation in the way of reduced hours life becomes for many unbearable. The average employer in recent years before the war found that a good deal of golf was needed to make his life satisfactory. The average workman has no such recreation. In a word, it is the business of intelligent employers to do everything in their power to reduce labour hours. It is one of the main ways of procuring industrial peace, from which they have so much to gain.

But inevitably we come back to the commercial test. Unless the reduced working hours are made good by maintained productivity, as against competing nations which work longer hours at less wages, the export trade of Britain, which is a main source of national wealth, will inevitably dwindle as regards manufactures; and the entire financial and industrial situation must accordingly worsen. Now, there is good ground for hoping that further reductions of working hours, with real wages maintained above pre-war levels, will be found compatible with even increased production. That indeed will be necessary, having regard to the burden of war debt. And as it is now agreed among economists that, broadly speaking, "cheap labour is dear labour," and that shorter hours thus far mean higher efficiency per hour, we may reasonably count on reducing hours yet further without economic loss. But it is all a matter of degree; and if we have in Germany an industrial competitor with labour equally efficient, working at somewhat lower wages for somewhat longer hours, as may very well happen for some years, the industrial situation may become a very anxious one. And if, as aforesaid, the employing class combines to seek a remedy in systematic protection, while probably Germany will be working towards a sounder position by means of free imports, our difficulties will tend to become acute.

For there appears to be gaining ground among our workers a two-sided delusion as to national wealth. On the one hand, it is widely believed that the national debt represents to its full extent actual wealth in the form of products of labour; and on the other hand it is believed that the State can create wealth and well-being to any extent by simply forcing maintenance of raised wages and shortened working-time, irrespective of the production of saleable goods for international exchange. In the case of many, it does not appear to be realised that a pension-roll of over two hundred and fifty millions, with an annual debt charge of three or four hundred millions more, cannot be supported without an increase of national production approximating to those figures. The amount of actual production required, indeed, is not to be

estimated in terms of those figures as values went before the war. Quantities which before the war had about half the value indicated by present figures will suffice. But still the required increase in real production is very great; and misconceptions which blind the workers to that essential fact may be extremely mischievous.

In particular, the notion that the figures of the national debt stand for divisible wealth over and above the totality of exchangeable objects, fixed or movable, is apt to make men miscalculate possibilities in a Bolshevik fashion, even without adoption of the Bolshevik doctrine of class war. In reality, the values which make possible the piling up of eight thousand millions of our scrip without sale of an equal amount of foreign scrip are expectations not realisable at any one time; and if the nominal claim to wealth represented by that scrip were divided among the masses of the people with the notion that it could be realised upon demand for goods, the instant shrinkage in the realisable value would be enormous. So with incomes. The high incomes do not stand for proportional consumption of the things required by the many; they stand largely for services and amenities. Were they divided, then, the services and amenities would not be concurrently divided, being in large measure insusceptible of division; and the application of the demand power to ordinary kinds of consumption would merely raise prices in the fashion in which we have seen prices progressively raised throughout the war. Only an increase in production of the things generally required could yield an increase in the real shares of things obtained by the majority, or, in other words, in real wages.

One reason for trusting that there will be a general awakening from the illusion as to the identity of individual riches, or command of wealth, with real national wealth, is that individual riches are actually being diminished both in name and in extent as a result of war changes. Super-tax on incomes has been carried to a point that certainly would not have been reached so early under peace conditions. Great fortunes, on the other hand, have no doubt been made out of war profits; but heavy taxation inevitably awaits these fortunes. At the same time, the former possibilities of luxury are noticeably curtailed. While five hundred thousand houses are needed to make up leeway for the people, hundreds of large mansions and thousands of roomy houses are wholly or partly empty, simply because servants cannot be got to run them. This state of things may be partly modified when munition workers to some extent resume the life of domestic service; but it is very doubtful whether the class will ever again be relatively as large as before. And certainly it is desirable in the national interest that a considerable number of women workers who have been doing productive work in the war period should continue to do so.

If in this way the old stimulus to envy and discontent set up among so many workers by the spectacle of idle luxury among the rich is lessened, there will be the less danger of mischievous and poverty-making restriction of real output through *sabotage* in the labour world. Certainly there remains stimulus enough of that kind. Wherever the town worker is able to penetrate into the rural

world for solace, he sees the motor-cars of the rich, on pleasure bent, and they throw up their dust in his face on the roads. The fact will have to be faced that only in the measure in which labour is enabled to share in the joys of life that are thus shareable will there be built up a state of industrial society so stable as to reduce to harmless proportions the economic waste wrought by labour strifes and the hardship and disquiet that accompany that waste and friction.

And so we come to one aspect of the question that is being discussed with new zest, rising to fury and bloodshed in several countries of Europe, ever since the collapse of the Russian Revolution in Bolshevism. The note of Bolshevism, of Spartacism, is the denial that labour needs can be realised by any process of peaceful and gradual development. Among ourselves, reformers who stop short of any doctrine of physical violence insist that there must be a radical change in the relations of labour and capital, amounting in effect to the elimination of capital as a profit-absorbing factor.

So long as the contention is by way of argument and persuasion, aiming only at majority legislation, the more discussion we have on such issues the better. There cannot be too much criticism. What has happened in Russia has been a blind leap from ignorant rhodomontade into ruinous violence. What has happened in Germany is the due result of the gospel of Marxian Socialism which so long held the ground there. That doctrine posited a wholly pessimistic view of the normal economic evolution of the modern industrial system, with a wholly optimistic view of what could and would be done when that system collapsed and was comprehensively replaced by a Socialistic one. The pessimism and the optimism have alike been demonstrated to be false. The old system was visibly if slowly bettering; the catastrophic change, recklessly attempted, has simply meant murderous strife and inevitable repression.

Our safety will be in a critical discussion that eliminates alike pessimism and optimism. To the new optimism which announces, avowedly as matter of faith that cannot be proved in advance, a conviction that absolute self-control of all industry, absolute management of all enterprise and all production by the workers immediately concerned, will yield not only better and higher life for all the workers, but a positive maximisation of output, there should be opposed, not that angry disparagement of labour hopes which comes so readily to irritated middle-class men, but a perfectly cool criticism, which will sift all the pretensions. Such criticism, indeed, may itself seem disparaging enough to those whose advocacy of labour claims is a heated partisanism, which sees in the capitalist nothing but harm, and in labour nothing but good. Sheer cold common-sense will point to the fact that the worker is of the same clay as the employer, the poor man the moral fellow of the rich, and that no man becomes either wise or good as the simple result of being born poor. Every characteristic that can make capitalism repellent—greed, heartlessness, insolence, brutality—is inevitably present in the totality that is named

Labour. The Liberal has had only too much cause to know that there is as much Tory Labour as Progressive Labour, finding as he has done, generation after generation, Tory Labour frustrating his best hopes and schemes as heedlessly as capital ever played with the life and well-being of the labour it has employed.

Labour, then, has as much to learn as capital if it is to fare nearly as well as its champions hope. If its leaders assume for it that in virtue of simply being Labour it is sure to take the right course, they will only be repeating the failures of the governing classes of the societies of the past. What they need above all things to keep before them is the lesson taught by their and our political experience for a century and more. The predominant philosophy of practical life in Britain has been neither an optimism nor a pessimism, but a Meliorism. And Meliorism means guarded experiment.

In experiment, then, we may hope to find, step by step, the solution of those labour troubles which, casting their shadows before, scared so many people in the recent general election into either withholding their votes or casting them for the labelled votaries of the political combination which promised to handle peace problems without party strife. No sooner was the planned result attained than the troubles broke forth with all the impetuosity that had been feared, and with a greater show of irresponsibility than had been hitherto seen. This will, of course, be given as a reason for the policy of a "strong combination." But the strong combination, as we have seen, is actually resorting to methods of trade policy which for seventy years past had been discredited in the eyes of the majority of thinking men, and had been consistently rejected by the nation in more than a dozen elections.

Such a spectacle should suffice at once to make the critics of Labour guarded in their censures, seeing that middle-class and upper-class statesmen are thus showing a capacity for blundering which organised labour does not outgo, and to rouse to vigilance all Members of Parliament who have any independent judgment left. If we are to have from the Coalition Parliament not only an unintelligent reversion to Protection, first by the use of the still unrepealed arbitrary powers given for purposes of war, and thereafter by a Tariff, there is no good future immediately ahead of us. And if in addition to this blind reaction on the fiscal side we are to have an attitude of mere helpless distrust towards labour, of reluctant concessions to menace without any rational experiment towards building up a new and better industrialism, the future may long be one of alarming unrest.

Two possibilities of State action have indeed been indicated by champions of Labour, and one of them has been pronounced for by a Minister. These are the nationalisation of railways and the nationalisation of mines. The first is clearly the simpler task, and its speedy fulfilment would give the opportunity for a really great experiment in the self-government of labour. An American Company has set the example—or *an* example—by guaranteeing to its employees a fixed share of the gross receipts,

and leaving to councils of the employees the punishment or dismissal of all individuals charged with offences either of omission or of commission. It is hardly likely that the Coalition Parliament, with its immense preponderance of commonplace Conservatism, will pass any scheme of that kind; but if it does not substitute some plan that is not devoid of forward-looking experiment it will probably have fresh trouble on its hands.

For the rest, something is to be hoped for from the initiative of the private employer. That class includes a number of men who during the war have fought and suffered in comradeship with the rank and file; and it still seems not too much to look to them for a new spirit of comradeship with their workers in the field of industry. Captains of industry are still potential for much good; and if they take up the new plans for industrial control in some such spirit of devotion to the common weal as inspired them through the years of war, they surely cannot fail to attain to some results not wholly incommensurate with the Great Victory. We have assuredly not lived up to that standard in our politics. Perchance some may contrive to do so in industry.

Given such a spirit, we might look for new developments of the old ideal of profit-sharing, which has never been left without a witness in British industry, though it has not had such a history as was hoped for in the days of Mill. Alike the science of war and the science of peace have made such advances in these five years that the majority of men have come to believe that the latter can make an end of the former. It would seem strange if such a hope should be realisable in respect of the strifes of nations without our coming in sight of a similar consummation as to the strifes of classes and interests within the State.

J. M. ROBERTSON.

THE RISE, DECLINE, AND FALL OF YOUNG TURKEY.

MOST readers will recall the popular demonstrations in civilised countries on the Turkish Revolution in 1908, and the deposition of Abdul Hamid in 1909. It was a series of "Love Feasts," says Mr. Morgenthau, the latest contributor to the history of that period. Thirty years of misrule or no-rule had worn out the patience of Moslems and Christians. Sheer stupidity opened the gates to any set of men resolved to change the system of government. Macedonia, where the government was at its worst, furnished most of the band of brothers who decided to substitute a constitutional government for despotism. Men of all creeds, and of none, formed themselves into the famous revolutionary Committee of Union and Progress. Their plans were well laid; for all who joined in opposition to the Sultan knew that they had to deal with a relentless foe. They organised themselves well. Their organisation was necessarily secret. But the members of the Committee stuck together until they had driven Abdul Hamid to proclaim a Constitution. It is true that a large section of the community did not know what was meant by a Constitution, but every one learned that the system of espionage and general misgovernment had come to an end. All sections of the community were grateful, and fraternisation became the order of the day. The revolution had partly triumphed. A counter-revolution was attempted on April 13th, 1909, with the result that Abdul Hamid was deposed and banished. The revolution had now completely triumphed. The tyrant had gone. The wildest exultations of the crowd were honestly justified. Priests and Hojas kissed each other, Turks and Armenians, Greeks and Jews vied in demonstrations of brotherhood. The demonstration was generally sincere. All appeared to be going harmoniously. Germany had backed the Sultan, and he had lost. All the influence which she had obtained by the lavish use of bakshish perished in a few days. German influence fell to zero; British and American rose to boiling point. The events in the interval between 1909 and the outbreak of the present war only indirectly concern us here, but it is necessary to mention some of them to show the action of the Committee, for that body was now triumphant.

HOW YOUNG TURKEY WENT WRONG.

The first serious intimation that Young Turkey was not united in maintaining the most important principle proclaimed at the revolution was given by the massacres at Adana. These occurred on April 13th, 1909 and following days, when 25,000 Armenians are said to have been killed; that is, on the days when the foolish attempt at counter-revolution was made in the capital. Everyone agreed that the movement was on behalf of Sultan Abdul Hamid. The massacres were quite of the type of those committed in

Armenia a dozen years earlier, and the popular verdict connected them with the counter-revolution. Gradually it became known that the Committee knew more about the matter than it cared to make public. Two or three years later it was hinted that the Salonica Committee had planned, and that the Committee in the capital knew nothing of the matter and was even opposed to it. No public statement was made, but many thoughtful men, Moslems and Christians alike, ceased without ostentation to support the Committee. Some of the Salonica members were outspoken. Religious equality, said they, was intended only for Moslems. Such statements were deeply resented by the non-Moslems. Some members spoke bravely in the Chamber. The majority of the Christians, conscious of the centuries of ill-treatment behind them, remained silent. The extremists increased in numbers and audacity. Gradually the extremists took the lead. They had a definite purpose, they intended to create a New Nation. Everything should be Turkish. At this stage it should be stated that the important movement commenced which has been fully described in your columns by the present writer on various occasions. The extremists among the Salonica Moslems had carefully nursed a new-conception. The nation must be made Turkish. They would Turkify everything—language, books, accounts, and even religion. They had been informed by certain literary men that the Turks were of Turanian race. The names of the streets were taken down, and the Roman and Greek characters were painted out and Turkish characters substituted. It did not matter that nine-tenths of the inhabitants could not read them. They must learn to do so. All business accounts of Turkish subjects must be in Turkish. All banks, native or foreign, must obey this rule. It was all very foolish, and the wiser heads of the community laughed but obeyed. All legal proceedings were to be in Turkish, and this even in Syria where not one man in fifty knew anything but Arabic. Then as to religion, Islam was a Semitic religion, and the Turks were not Semites.

Such measures were generally regarded as the fads of a few doctrinaires. When, however, they were enacted into law by representatives who were known mostly as the nominees of the Committee, hostility was aroused. The real leaders of the country knew nothing and cared nothing for changes of that kind; nor did the public. At a later period it became necessary to find some measure which would appeal more directly to Moslem sympathy. Then it was discovered that the Capitulations, which were in existence before 1453, were an insult inflicted on the race by foreign prejudice. They must be abolished. When this was done, every Power in Europe, not even excepting Germany and Austria, objected. First, because the Capitulations were treaties with the respective foreign Powers and could not be set aside at the bidding of one only; and, secondly, because every foreign Ambassador knew that the Turkish administration of law was hopelessly bad. The law was deficient, the decisions usually bought or sold, and the execution of judgments next to impossible; still the decree was supposed to please the mob.

THE BIG IDEA OF YOUNG TURKEY.

As the extremists of the Committee gained power in the Chamber, their great idea developed. The three or four leading statesmen, notably Talaat and Enver, soon approved of it. Turkey was to be a nation in which everything should be Turkified; all people who would not become Turkified must be got rid of. It was a large order, and it may well be doubted whether its vastness was at first realised by the Committee. But when after the second Balkan War (1913) the Turks drove the Greek settlers out of Thrace with wanton cruelty, their action was not merely an act of war but an attempt to get rid of the Greeks from Adrianople to the Bosphorus. They succeeded so well that later on, when the World War commenced, they repeated the experiment in the district south of the Black Sea towards Angora and the vilayet of Aidin. Soon they began to ask the question: Could not the Armenians be dealt with "in like fashion"? The great idea was accepted by the Committee generally, and especially by Talaat and Enver. From that time it became evident that the Committee no longer entertained ideas of religious equality as applicable to non-Moslems. I repeat that the first fact which made it clear that the Committee was divided, and that the extremists would have nothing to do with religious equality, was the massacre of Adana. When in the autumn of 1914 the most respected members left the Committee, such as Bystani Effendi, Arslan, the ablest Minister of Posts and Telegraphs which Turkey ever had, and Javid, the best financial authority, a man of Jewish race who belonged to a sect which in the seventeenth century became also Moslem, a great blow was inflicted on the reputation of the Committee. Its moral authority had gone. Neither the public nor the Ministers cared about its decisions, and by the summer of 1916 the Committee of Union and Progress, though nominally in existence, was generally looked upon with contempt.

THE ARMENIAN HORRORS.

When the World War commenced the extreme section was steadily gaining influence, and there soon occurred a series of outrages upon Armenians which are certainly the worst recorded in the West for the last six centuries. I have not space to enter into details of the horrors. Probably at least six hundred thousand persons were deliberately killed. Who were responsible for this hideous series of crimes? I call attention here to the fact that the Committee must itself share the responsibility. Its important members were Talaat Pasha, not yet Grand Vizier, and Enver Pasha, Minister of War. The worst of the massacres came about by what is called "deportation." The Turks had deported the Greeks from Thrace. This policy they followed up by expelling them from Chorum and the north portion of Asia Minor near it, on pretext that they were merely removing them from the Black Sea coast. The accounts given by eyewitnesses that have recently arrived in England are of the most ghastly character; droves of little Greek children with nothing to eat were thus deported. Hundreds died in the process. The Armenian population must be got rid of by the same method. Men, women, and

children were driven from one neighbourhood to another, often without food, and not seldom without any clothing whatever, and were subject to the pillage of Kurds and other Moslems as they travelled. It was a devilish way, because it soon became evident that mere removal from one tract of country to another was not the object, but extermination. It was so successful that Talaat boasted that he had done more in three months than Abdul Hamid in thirty years to get rid of the Armenian trouble. In reply to Mr. Morgenthau's enquiries, Talaat stated that "The Committee of Union and Progress have carefully considered the policy of extermination, and that the policy pursued was that which they had officially adopted," an assertion which is twice repeated, (page 330), and that "the idea of deportation had not been reached hastily, but as the result of prolonged and careful deliberation." On another occasion Talaat declared: "We have already disposed of three-fourths of the Armenians," and "we will not have them in Anatolia" (page 338). Enver Pasha made similar admissions, though not to Mr. Morgenthau. Most valuable testimony on this point is given by Mr. Lepsius, a German Superintendent of Christian Missions, who had visited the country after the massacres under Abdul Hamid, and had assisted in establishing hospitals and giving relief to the sufferers. He visited Mr. Morgenthau in 1915. On his arrival from Germany he requested the American Ambassador and was allowed to see the Consular reports from Armenia. He was greatly shocked at the statements made, but shortly afterwards was "staggered by the frankness" of Enver, Minister of War, who told him in so many words that they at last had an opportunity to rid themselves of the Armenians, and that they proposed to use it. Wangenheim, the German Ambassador in Constantinople, was the one man, and his Government the one Government that could have stopped the massacres; but he refused, adding: "Our one aim is to win the war." While these statements point to the direct authors of these horrors, they show that the Committee were acting in complicity.

The real rulers of Turkey in 1914 and the two following years were mainly three, and with them and their associates I must now deal.

THE RUMP COMMITTEE.

The real rulers of the country did not derive their authority either from the Chamber or the Sultan. They were Talaat Pasha, Enver Pasha, and Wangenheim, the German Ambassador. By August, 1914, the Turkish Army, under Enver, was better clothed, better armed and equipped, than it had ever been. This was due to Enver and German money. Hundreds of German officers had been sent into all parts of Turkey where troops could be gathered. Even in June of that year I saw between Samsun and Sivas drilling of recruits under German officers proceeding with frantic haste. Enver, energetic and entirely given over to Germany's service, was converting the armies which had been driven before the Serbians at Kumanovo and before the Bulgars at Lule Burgas and Kirk Kilisse, into a good fighting force. The great idea of

Germany was to take possession of the Turkish Army, and by the time of the opening of the World's War Germany had nearly succeeded. But would the Turkish Government consent? Equally energetic efforts were made to gain the Turkish Fleet. Admiral Limpus and his staff of British officers were sent away. Wangenheim, the German Ambassador, and Liman von Sanders alternately cajoled and bullied the Turks into committing infamous acts of war which would force Turkey to come in on the side of Germany. The Turks were on the brink of a precipice. They must be pushed over. The struggle showed the Kaiser's crew at their worst. It is needless to repeat the story of the *Goeben* and *Breslau*, with its constant scenes of violations of international law. Bullying and force had their way. It was in vain that Sir Louis Mallet informed the Grand Vizier that Turkish ships had been sent to the Black Sea under German officers. Said Halim, the Grand Vizier, knew it, and was as much troubled at the news as Sir Louis himself. It was in vain that the Grand Vizier asked that the German sailors should be landed from the two ships, which were technically only seeking shelter. The Turks would not declare war. They were pushed over the precipice on October 29th, when Odessa and other Black Sea ports were bombarded. Germany had succeeded in forcing Turkey into the war. The best men had now left the Committee. Hardly any of the members remaining had had experience in government. When non-Moslem members and others intimated their disapproval of the actions and tendencies of the Committee and left the party, the ground was thus cleared for the more daring and chauvinistic spirits. Then the government of Turkey fell into the hands of these men and of Germany.

THE NEW RULERS OF TURKEY.

Mr. Ambassador Morgenthau's remarkable volume is of great value in enabling us to sketch the *dramatis personae*. His snapshot pictures are always interesting. That of Talaat Pasha is especially valuable, because he was the dominating spirit. Talaat had risen by sheer brain power. He is asserted to have been a gipsy or Bulgarian Pomak by origin. Without any aid from family or position he came to be recognised in the Chamber and in the Cabinet as the chief, or nearly the chief man, in it. About forty-five years of age when the war broke out, he had fought his way in the Chamber over the heads of men who had birth and influence on their side. When the Revolution took place he had been a telegraph operator at a salary of between £3 and £4 a month. Gradually, all the Members of the House bowed to his decision. He could make himself fairly understood in French, and with the versatility of an Eastern adopted the knife and fork and certain European manners. Mr. Morgenthau gives a curious little picture of Talaat at home. There he "reverted to type." No longer dressed in European clothes, we see him as a Pomak peasant, dressed as one and living as one. The Ambassador soon became on singularly easy terms with the Peasant Premier, and the conversations which he records are of the most naïve character. "We don't like the Germans, but it suits us to let them take

charge at the present moment. They think they are using us; we know that we are using them." The dialogue between Talaat and the American Ambassador is vivid. There is no reticence, and everything is related just as uttered. Talaat never used words to conceal thoughts, but (in the presence of Mr. Morgenthau) blurts out his ideas like a fearless schoolboy, very often in curt monosyllables, and put invariably without any diplomatic camouflage, or sometimes he sulks; but usually he is genial.

After England entered the war, Talaat became more irritated than ever against this country. He entertained for a while the conviction that America sympathised with Turkey, and often asked her Ambassador to send messages to President Wilson which were quite inopportune. After one of Mr. Morgenthau's many protests against the ill-treatment of the Greeks and Armenians, Talaat asked with the frankness which seems to have characterised all their conversations: "Why do you, a Jew, trouble about Christians? We do not ill-treat your race, and you ought not to trouble us about our treatment of the Armenians." Mr. Morgenthau explained that of the one hundred millions whom he represented ninety-seven millions were Christians, and on humanitarian grounds alone they had a right to press Turkey to treat the Armenians humanely. Talaat flatly denied such right, and as a matter of fact, in spite of many laudable efforts on the part of the Ambassador, Talaat hardened his heart, and the appalling massacre of Armenians must be largely attributed to him. Talaat remains the most prominent figure on Mr. Morgenthau's stage, and I do not know of any conversations, either in English or French memoirs, which show such plain speaking of one man to another as do those reported in Mr. Morgenthau's book.

Enver Pasha figures largely, because he was Minister of War. Whatever his origin, his education in Berlin made him a courtier; and whether we see him in the richly furnished palace which he occupied after he had become a Damat—that is after he had been given a Turkish princess in marriage—and with all the means of affluence around him, he rarely forgets his position as Minister of War, and in this respect contrasts very strikingly with Talaat. He had deserved well of the Committee of Union and Progress, because on two important occasions he had rendered great service. It was he who first raised the standard of revolt on the Resna Hills. It was he also who, after the Serbians, Bulgars, and Greeks had defeated Turkey, never despaired, and succeeded amid the quarrels of the small States in seizing Adrianople. He boasted that he never withdrew an order. Talaat would yield to argument on small matters at least, as when the Turks claimed to imprison a British Canadian subject who had been working under the American Missions. After a long argument Talaat burst out: "You can have your man!" Enver never yielded; but the story is now carefully told of his being compelled to give way. Enver had ordered, while the attack upon the Dardanelles was taking place, that the two or three thousand British and French subjects should be sent down to the Peninsula, to be placed in villages which our ships were supposed to be bombarding. It was in vain that the Ambassador represented

that the whole civilised world would condemn the order. Enver had given it and would not recall it. After a long argument, all that the Ambassador could obtain was that forty or fifty persons only of each nationality should be sent to the Peninsula. Meanwhile the news of the brutal order had reached London *viâ* America, and Sir Edward Grey, in answer to a question put to him in the House, replied that the news was true, and that he had requested the American Government to notify the Sublime Porte that England would hold all the persons personally responsible for the execution of so brutal an order if any British subject were injured. When the message reached Enver he became the savage of five centuries earlier. The British and French subjects who had been actually sent to the Dardanelles were returned to Constantinople.

Probably to Enver was due a great step which led to some of the worst of the Armenian massacres. The Armenians after the Revolution of 1909 had been for the first time on record drafted into the Army, and their capacity as fighters had been highly spoken of by Shefket and other Turkish generals; but Enver and other Turks soon saw that it was dangerous to have Armenian soldiers side by side with Turks, and he quietly carried out the design of drafting Armenians into the Army but employing them only as labourers. It was the plan already devised by the extremists of the Committee for getting rid of the Armenians.

The other prominent members on our stage were Liman von Sanders and Wangenheim, the German Ambassador. One obtains a vivid picture of Wangenheim, the big, burly German. This old hand at diplomatic intrigue wished to induce his younger colleagues all unused to wiles and subterfuges of old diplomats, and persuaded the Turkish Minister of Marine, Jemal Bey, to visit Mr. Morgenthau and make a request that he should telegraph to the President a statement, as coming from the Sublime Porte. Kindly but shrewd Jemal trembled in every "hair of his whiskers" as he gave his message, which the clear-headed American saw was really one from Wangenheim, and knew at once how to deal with the real as well as the pretended sender.

And thus, in spite of all his intrigue, the experienced Teuton failed once more. Wangenheim was the typical slave of the Kaiser, and constantly refused to lift a finger to aid Morgenthau in his efforts to stay the wanton slaughter of the Armenians or secure the release of the British or French prisoners. He was an unpleasant figure on the stage, and in marked contrast to his Austrian colleague, the kindly and gentlemanly Pallavicini, whom apparently he slighted. Wangenheim died suddenly in October, 1915. In his last conversation with Mr. Morgenthau he deliberately refused to say a word in favour of the Armenians. He had a fit of apoplexy immediately after this statement and was taken home in his motor car, and died three days later.

A few words must be said of Liman von Sanders. We see him as a distinguished German soldier, arriving in Constantinople in the spring of 1914; full of his own importance and unwilling to abandon even the shadow of his dignity. Had not the Kaiser himself devoted two hours of his time to coaching him in his duties

as special envoy to the Sultan, and then, on the following morning, exacted another long interview before the train left Berlin? We see the General sulking at an official dinner, because the place assigned to him at table was not high enough. Yet the American Ambassador, knowing the niceties of Court etiquette, had carefully considered the order of precedence, and had adopted that arranged by the doyen of the diplomatic body. The spectacle of the General disturbing the harmony of the dinner is not pleasant, and one is glad to see that the blustering soldier is shown to be at fault. We naturally compare the picture with that of the same General four years later, standing with his German and Turkish Army before Aleppo, where he is supposed to be expecting General Allenby's force and that advancing from Mesopotamia, and remember that the blustering soldier finds that his army melts away before the appearance of the British armies.

Before leaving the persons generally foremost on the Turkish stage, mention must be made of Bedri Bey, Chief of the Police. We get glimpses of him and see him as one who delighted in cruelty. He was full of vanity.*

An incident which provokes a smile of pride in every Englishman who knows the East may be noted. Both Talaat and Enver were at the Dardanelles when our fleet had to retire. It was, of course, natural that they and all the Turks should be elated. Enver boasted that they had done what no other Powers had yet achieved. They had defeated the entire British Navy. They took full and detailed notice of the damage done to our ships. Then they waited to see what the British official report of damage would be. To their astonishment it agreed precisely with their own. It was surprising, incredible, but true! They spent hours in discussing what was the explanation, and at length arrived at a transparently foolish one. If they had asked the Turkish peasants they would have been told that Englishmen do not lie. It is at least true that we have had this reputation in the East for centuries. Before I left Constantinople in December, 1914, the Turks of all classes declared the Wolff's telegrams with which Wangenheim had flooded the city to be false, and looked to the British for truth.

I do not propose to sketch the progress of the war between the Allies and Turkey. It is sufficient here to say that, following Berlin, they were able to placard the city with reports of German triumphs. They reported victories over the Armenians and the Arabs, and they naturally made much of the failure of the first expedition which we sent from India; but by that time it was becoming evident that the Turkish Army was not succeeding according to plan. An unusually great effort was made to send an expedition to Bagdad to drive the new British Army under General Marshall out of the country. In Constantinople more serious preparations were made for this expedition than for any other during the war. Liman von Sanders left Haidar Pasha, the Constantinople terminus of the

* I know of no book that more clearly reflects the mentality not only of Bedri Bey, but of all highly placed Turks generally, their childish delight in cruelty, their carelessness of human suffering and the vanity of the Turk's wishes than does Mr. Morgenthau's valuable book.

Bagdad Railway, for the new seat of war early in September, 1917. A vast collection of munitions of war, with all the paraphernalia for a great campaign, was gathered around the great German buildings at Haidar Pasha. Then the unexpected, or, as many people believed, the miraculous happened. Trainloads of munitions were lying around the station, when a small fire broke out which spread rapidly, and the discharge of the munitions prevented the access of the firemen. The waggon loads of ammunition, the station, the biggest German building in Turkey, and all the objects intended for crushing the English in Bagdad were consumed in a fire which lasted eight days. Then probably the Turkish officials themselves recognised that the resistance of Turkey was hopeless. The public followed with intense interest the scraps of information which were gathered from newspapers smuggled into the country.

Nevertheless Talaat and Enver struggled on, but their failure, together with the death of the kindly but incompetent Sultan Mahomet V., and the accession of his successor encouraged the long-smouldering opposition to the Committee to declare itself; and when, six months ago, the Sultan appointed the late Turkish Ambassador in London, Tewfik, to be Grand Vizier, Talaat and Enver disappeared. By last Christmas they were fugitives. It is not generally known where they are, though it is believed they sought refuge in Berlin. The subsequent dissolution of the Chamber marks the end of their influence and of Young Turkey.

The latest news to hand as I write is given by *The Times*, of February 10th: The trials of forty persons, many of whom are alleged to have been guilty of cruelties to the Armenians, had commenced. If such trials are properly conducted, there will necessarily be severe punishments inflicted on many persons. In spite of the indications given in the latest letter that secret agents of the Committee are working against the Commissioners of the Allies, I think it unlikely that the Committee of Union and Progress will ever again raise its head.

The dream of Young Turkey was a noble one. Moslems and Christians were to live together as brothers. Unfortunately, their efforts were cold-shouldered. The typical diplomat has no use for dreams or dreamers. This want of sympathy continued until after the arrival in Turkey of Sir Louis Mallet; but it was too late. The Committee had been taken possession of by extremists and those who had no sympathy with the dreamers. Germany had gained possession of her prey, and Turkey and Germany were to stand or fall together.

Young Turkey had abandoned her noble dreams, allowed those who never had entertained such dreams to supplant them, and threw herself into the arms of Germany. Talaat found that he could not get rid of Germany as he had believed. Young Turkey fell, and with her perished also Old Turkey.

EDWIN PEARS.

NOTE.—The references are to Mr. Morgenthau's story published in England under the title "Secrets of the Bosphorus," and in America simply as "Ambassador Morgenthau's story."

THE LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL ELECTION.

THE London County Council election will take place on Thursday, March 6th.

Despite the difficulties under which it will be held, the election will be of peculiar importance. To begin with, the new Council must take immediate and vigorous steps to repair the serious wastage and to make up the arrears caused by the war in every department of the Council's administration. In the next place, certain special tasks of great urgency must be dealt with, *e.g.*, the prompt carrying out of an adequate Housing Scheme, the preparation of the Education Scheme under the new Act, co-operation with the Government in carrying out the proposed reform of the Poor Law administration, &c. All such undertakings should be part of a concerted and comprehensive effort to raise the standard of life throughout London, and especially in its poorer districts. Moreover, the new Council must take the initial steps to bring about such reform of London government as will create an up-to-date and effective instrument of administration for Greater London, and for the solution of the far-reaching problems of Housing, Health, Education, Transit and Electricity in which the whole of Greater London has a common concern. The authority and even the existence of the Central Municipal Council depend upon its possessing sufficient public spirit and determination to handle these vast tasks with courage and wisdom. The eager demand for social reconstruction will give short shrift to any municipal bodies which act as a drag upon progress, instead of taking a resolute lead in securing it. Municipal administration on a representative and democratic basis is essential to social well-being and progress. Yet if it is to be preserved in its integrity and developed to its full extent, the representatives of London must show themselves sufficiently keen and capable to satisfy the immense demands of the present situation.

Happily, those who are alive to the greatness both of the task and of the opportunity, can take part in the present electoral campaign with greater confidence and equanimity than have been possible for many years past. The possibility of this more hopeful outlook has been brought about not only by increased goodwill between parties upon the Council, and by their co-operation throughout the war, but above all by the steady growth of agreement between them in regard to many vital interests and by the preparations that have already been made, by general consent, to deal with some of the most urgent problems of reconstruction. Whatever may be the relative strength of parties in the new Council, there is now good hope both of general agreement upon a much more advanced policy than has been dreamt of for many years, and also of the existence of sufficient driving power in the Council to secure the execution of this policy. It is in the interests of London that this driving power should be made as effective as possible.

A comparison of the programmes issued by the various parties will certainly justify this hopeful forecast. The three parties in

the field are the Progressives, the Municipal Reformers, and the London Labour Party. The Progressive programme is substantially that which I outlined in the October number of *THE CONTEMPORARY REVIEW*. In that article an advanced policy was set forth dealing with the reform of London Government, Housing, Public Health, Food, Education, Recreation and Amusements, the Municipal control of traffic, public transport, and the supply of electricity, the improvement of London, together with certain proposals in regard to Labour policy, the reform of the Poor Laws, and finance. Since then some other items of practical but subordinate importance have been added, to which I will refer later on.

To sum up, the Progressive Party in their election manifesto urge upon the electors "the need for adopting a far-reaching and comprehensive policy of social advance and reconstruction," the ideal of which should be "the determination to raise the whole standard of life, especially in the poorest districts and homes of London." In promoting this policy the party declare that they "will have regard to progress not politics, and will act as far as possible with all parties and sections to create a London that shall be worthy of its Imperial position and of the heroic sacrifices of its sons."

The manifesto issued by the Municipal Reform Party shows a great advance in the attitude of that party, and a change of temper in regard to many vital matters that have hitherto been in dispute. For example, substantial agreement between the two parties has been reached in regard to housing, health, education, and Poor Law administration. The Municipal Reform leaders are agreed that the reform of London government is necessary, and in order to deal with it they urge that H.M. Government should institute an inquiry by Royal Commission or otherwise, with a view to a great enlargement of the area of municipal London and the creation of means for dealing "efficiently and economically" with its common municipal problems. In regard to the Council's tramways, for a long time a battle-ground between the parties, the Municipal Reform leaders announce that their "policy for the future" will be "to develop the system, in order that it may be worked with the maximum efficiency and convenience to the travelling public."

It cannot, however, be said that at present the local and sectional interests that are behind the Municipal Reform Party are ready to sacrifice the local vetoes which have hampered the development of the tramway system, or that they will tolerate a bold reform of London government unless reactionary tendencies both inside and outside the Council are effectively checked by the strong reinforcement of the progressive sections. Yet, speaking generally, the policy of "going slow" upon which the Municipal Party came into power twelve years ago has been abandoned by the leaders of the party, while their old suspicion and dislike of the Council have changed into real concern for the vital interests of municipal government, threatened as it has recently been by bureaucratic

Boards and projects. This change of attitude is a hopeful augury for the future progress of London.

The policy of the Labour Party, so far as it relates to the administrative tasks of the Council, does not appear to differ materially from that of the Progressive Party or to make demands upon which a fair understanding between all Parties should be difficult of attainment. In regard to all such matters the pressure of Labour should be welcomed in order to set the pace. In particular, the Labour Party adopt the demand for the reform of London Government. Hence on this most important subject the Council will be unanimous, though the constructive task of combining central authority with local autonomy over a greatly extended area will be one of great difficulty and complexity. Still, with sufficient wisdom and patient good-will a general agreement ought not to be beyond reach.

The Progressive policy includes certain objects that find no place in the Municipal Reform programme, and in respect of them it is probable that differences may exist between the two Parties. These objects include the reform of the Insurance Acts, the adequate supply of municipally-controlled markets and increased public control of the wholesale supply of meat, milk, and bread, the establishment of a Municipal Authority to deal with traffic problems, municipal regulation of public means of locomotion so as to prevent undue competition and meet the needs of all neighbourhoods, and effective municipal control of the production and distribution of electric power. As to this last the Municipal Reformers will probably be willing to concede powers to the existing producers to the detriment of complete public control. The Progressive Party also urge that the Government should take action to prevent the general raising of rents when the present Act lapses, provision being made to prevent buildings from falling into disrepair.

The field, however, in which serious differences are most likely to arise between the three Parties is that of Finance. The Progressive policy makes the following demands:—

1. That an increased proportion of local expenditure on national service should be borne by grants from the National Exchequer.
2. That such reforms of rating should be secured as will lighten the burden upon industries, encourage enterprise, bring undeveloped land into the market, and lower rents.
3. Equalisation of Rates.
4. The equitable apportionment of the cost of improvements between the public and private interests that benefit by them.
5. Ground values to be rated according to the valuation of 1910, made available for the purpose. Uniformity of valuation, carried out by a single authority, is also included in the Progressive policy.

The Municipal Reformers are agreed in seeking more adequate Exchequer grants in aid of local expenditure. Indeed, they are inclined to make the incurring of such expenditure conditional on receiving such enlarged grants. They also advocate, in

general terms, "a more equitable distribution of rate burdens." As to any other financial reforms their manifesto is silent, probably because the Party as a whole is not prepared to accept such measures for completely equalising rates and increasing revenues as are contended for by the Progressives. The main financial plank of the Labour policy is stated as follows: "No more rates. The abolition of rates and the expenses of local government to be borne by a national Income Tax devoted to municipal needs and so graduated that the heaviest burden would fall upon those best able to bear it." Now there is everything to be said in favour of a just graduation of taxation, and a good deal to be said in favour of a Municipal Income Tax, though probably more objection would be taken to it in this country than in Germany, where this method of finance prevails. But the proposal of the Labour Party is that a national Income Tax should be levied by Parliament and its proceeds dealt out to the local authorities according to their expenditure. It is not too much to say that such a plan, if adopted, would strike a deadly blow at municipal government. It is wholly inconsistent with the decision of the Labour Party to join in demanding Home Rule for London. It is idle to suppose that Parliament would levy a tax and hand its proceeds over to the uncontrolled administration of local bodies. If the cost of local administration were to be taken over by Parliament, either local authorities would be altogether superseded by Government departments or else they would be reduced to puppets rigidly controlled at every point by these departments. Such extinction of local self-government would be fatal to public spirit and destroy the popular co-operation in demanding and working out social reforms, which is vital to sound progress. To ask in the same breath for Home Rule for London and for the payment of its entire bill by national taxation is to plunge into an inconsistency that approaches a contradiction in terms and opens up dangerous possibilities, especially at a time when it is the fashion to set up supervisory boards to the detriment of local responsibility.

So much for parties and programmes. Never was there such widespread good-will towards social reform. Never was it more important to awaken a popular demand and to gain for it adequate representation on the Council so that good-will may become practically operative and fruitful. The outlook for London is hopeful provided that London can be successfully roused at a time of distraction and war-weariness to demand the speedy accomplishment of a policy of progress that shall be worthy of the occasion and proportionate to the need. Such a policy must be directed by wise and humane administration to lighten the burden of disabilities that weighs heavily upon the poorest citizens, and must enlist all parties and classes in a true comradeship to promote the common weal. In arriving at such a policy the Progressive Party is entitled by its past record and its continued loyalty to its best ideals to take a leading part.

J. SCOTT LIDGETT.

JAPAN AT KIAOCHAU AND THE PEACE CONFERENCE.

I.

AS the steamer approaches Tsingtau the traveller sees a most attractive city nestling along the shores of a wide bay and spreading over the low hills which rise from the water. The further hills are covered with trees, planted during the German occupation, many cherries brilliant with blossom in the spring, but the majority the graceful acacia. Distant mountains form an imposing background to a scene of much beauty. The houses stand forth brilliantly in the sunshine, their white rough-cast walls and red roofs presenting a charming picture. The steamer comes to anchor off a small island where it rolls heavily in the swell while waiting for quarantine inspection. When this formality is over, the vessel takes up its anchor and steams into a well-protected artificial harbour, the necessity for which is evident, as the wide spreading bay, though only about two miles wide at the entrance, is not sufficiently land-locked for the port at its mouth to escape the heavy rollers of the Yellow Sea, especially when the wind is from north or east.

First impressions of the town are favourable. On landing the visitor finds wide thoroughfares, well macadamised or laid with asphalt, along which motors glide with the least amount of friction and jinrikisha speed noiselessly on rubber wheels, the only blot on the scene being the extremely ragged attire of the Chinese pullers. Even the Chinese wheel-barrow, with its monstrous load, propelled by a perspiring coolie, is provided for by a narrow stone paving on either side of the road, thus preventing the roadway being worn into ruts. The business part of the town has many attractive buildings, mostly rough-cast walls with red roofs, while the residential section, with every house different in design yet the whole presenting a pleasing harmony, gives the impression rather of the wealthier quarters in a Continental city than of a busy port in China. Wide roads, diversified here and there with a green space; detached houses of attractive design; substantial public buildings, now occupied by the Japanese authorities; a railway station that looks like a church, and a church that looks like a town hall, all testify to the genius for town planning of the Germans and also to the lavish expenditure that went to make Tsingtau the finest city of its size in the Far East.

There are three substantial foreign-style hotels, built by Germans, but now in the hands of a Japanese company. During the summer these hotels are well filled with visitors, mostly from Shanghai, the dry climate of Tsingtau, which serves to temper the heat, being a welcome change from the humidity of the more southern port. At the eastern end of the residential quarter, away from the business section, a beach of red sand unmixed with shingle is gay with bathing-boxes, from which emerge crowds of happy children accompanied by a few elders. Most of the bathing-boxes were originally owned by the Germans, but these have now taken up a position a

little further east. The men are mostly prisoners in Japan; the women and children who remain gather here in the afternoon with the pastor and teachers of the German school and a few elderly men. In 1914, before the war, the German population was about 2,000; in 1917 it was 333. During the four years of war some of those who were children at its outbreak are now almost young men and women.

Tsingtau is a very different place in the winter from what it is in the summer. The cold is intense, there being often twenty degrees of frost. Great care has to be taken lest a chill should develop into pneumonia. Most of the trees being deciduous, the branches are bare, while the undergrowth becomes brown, the aspect of the hills being thus entirely changed. Little snow falls, however, the days being generally unclouded, and the brilliant sun abates much of the keenness of the wind. But in the winter in these times the town looks somewhat desolate. The summer visitors have departed. Amusements there are none; the pleasant O.K. Club gathers the few non-German residents for cards or billiards, and there are occasional réunions at private houses. But in the evening the streets of the residential part of the town are quiet and deserted, the silence after dark only being broken by the footfall of a chance pedestrian or the occasional jingle of the bells of a jinrikisha.

Even in summer the residential part of Tsingtau, apart from the Bund, has in these days a quiet and even dreary aspect. Many of the shops owned by Germans are closed; some have their fronts bricked up; a few have been taken over by Chinese or Japanese. Houses in process of erection stand with gaping windows desolate, all work having stopped, giving the impression of a town whose development has suddenly been arrested. On approaching the business quarter of the town, however, the scene becomes more animated. Here the Chinese and Japanese carry on their business almost as usual. Streets of houses for Japanese have been built or are in process of erection. In the latter part of 1916 the Tsingtau Building Company erected an entire new district. This consisted of eighty-eight houses in twenty-four groups, and was erected in the centre of Tsingtau, in a section of the city that was formerly a waste place of gulleys and brickmaking sheds. It is called Shinmachi (New Road). All the streets and roads in Tsingtau, it may be remarked, have been given Japanese names, the former German appellations being blotted out. It is noteworthy that the houses built in Shinmachi have been erected on German designs, so that they harmonise in appearance with the rest of the city. The interiors, however, are Japanese, and, despite the great cold experienced at Tsingtau, the only method of heating these new dwellings seems to be by the miserable *hibachi*, or charcoal brazier. While a part of this area has been reserved for shops and ordinary dwellings, the greater section is reserved for licensed quarters for prostitutes, houses for geisha, and tea-houses of a certain class. About fifty out of the eighty-eight new houses constitute the licensed quarter, without which a Japanese city would not be complete.

There has been a great increase in the Japanese population of

Tsingtau since the occupation. Under the Germans the Japanese population consisted of a few hundreds. Immediately after the occupation it increased to 3,000; at the end of March, 1915, it was 12,000, of which it may be remarked that more than one out of every two persons had taken out business licences, a large proportion of these being for keeping restaurants and similar establishments. In December, 1917, the population had swelled to 16,680, while in the leased territory of Tsingtau Japanese numbered 18,655. The total Japanese population in Shantung at the end of last year was 25,104. The Chinese population of Tsingtau in December, 1917, was 22,484. Of Germans and Austrians there were 333, mostly women and children, while Americans and Europeans numbered 154. There are two large barracks, known under the Germans as the Moltke and Bismarck barracks, but now under Japanese names, where a considerable force of troops is maintained.

With the opening of Tsingtau after the siege there was a great influx of undesirable Japanese, the offscourings of Manchuria and ports in China. Some steps were taken to check the incursion of this undesirable element, but without much effect. It is, perhaps, only natural that a low class should be brought together by the expectation of profit in a new territory, while the character of those who set up restaurants and ply the trade of licensed-house keepers, at a place containing a large body of troops, is naturally not of the best. But the effect of so large a proportion of this class of Japanese is not attractive, and conveys a disagreeable effect to the visitor.

In view of the character of the Japanese population in Tsingtau it is not surprising that the Chinese connect the many bandit outrages in Shantung with the disreputable class of Japanese who have found shelter in the leased territory. A Chinese correspondent at Tsinan-fu says that after the fall of Tsingtau and the substitution of German interests in Shantung by Japanese, the number of Japanese undesirables has been rapidly increasing until at the present time, they can be found in every district of Shantung, especially in the districts around Tsingtau. These Japanese supply arms to the bandits at high prices and deliver them to the bandits at their quarters far away in the interior districts. In view of the increasing danger of this condition of affairs, the Japanese authorities at Tsingtau recently issued proclamations prohibiting the landing of doubtful characters in the leased territory of Kiaochau; but these persons are generally landed in Chinese territory beyond the notice of the Japanese officials.

The problem, it is admitted, is a difficult one, but when it is borne in mind that there is a rigorous passport system in Japan and in all territory held by Japanese, it ought not to be impossible to prevent the influx of Japanese undesirables both into the leased territory and along the coast-line where Chinese jurisdiction prevails. These bad characters are responsible for a great deal of the friction that arises between the Chinese and Japanese authorities. They give Tsingtau itself a bad name and discredit Japanese administration.

II.

To the credit of the Japanese authorities it must be said they have maintained the public works at Tsingtau in good condition. The excellent roads made by the Germans are kept in first-class order and the general administration is good. On the other hand, the forts erected by the Germans have been dismantled. The original lease extorted by Germany from China was for ninety-nine years, dating from 1897, the year in which the port was seized as reparation for the murder of two German missionaries. The extent of the leased territory of Kiaochau is about 117 square miles, and a further area, comprising a zone of about 32 miles, measured from any point on the shore of the bay, constitutes a reservation within which the Chinese Government entered into an undertaking not to issue any ordinances without the consent of Germany. On a hill overlooking the port of Tsingtau there is cut into the rock an inscription in German commemorating the seizure of the territory. Over this the Japanese have cut in deeply incised ideographs the date of surrender—November 7th, 1914.

What is to be the future of this port, and under whose jurisdiction is it to be placed by the Peace Conference? The question is one constantly raised in Japan, and it meets with only vague answers. In the ultimatum presented to Germany on August 15th, 1914, Japan stated that her object was to safeguard the peace of the Far East, and in pursuance of this policy Germany was incidentally called upon "to deliver, on a date not later than September 15th, to the Imperial Japanese authorities, without condition or compensation, the entire leased territory of Kiaochau, *with a view to the eventual restoration of the same to China.*" With the object of reassuring the world, and especially the United States, that in taking this action Japan was not animated by any motives of aggression, Marquis Okuma sent a message to the *New York Independent*, dated August 24th, the day following the declaration of war against Germany, in which he made the following declaration:—

"As Premier of Japan, I have stated, and I now again state to the people of America and of the world, that Japan has no ulterior motive, no desire to secure more territory, no thought of depriving China or other people of anything which they now possess. The Government and my people have given their word and their pledge, which will be as honourably kept as Japan always keeps promises."

This would appear definite enough, and was generally taken to imply that when Tsingtau surrendered, the leased territory of Kiaochau would be returned to China. The British Government apparently interpreted Japan's attitude in this sense, and in confirmation of this view the British Press Bureau published an extract from a speech by Marquis Okuma in which the Japanese Premier declared that Japan "harbours no design for territorial aggrandisement, and entertains no desire to promote any other selfish ends." According to the Press Bureau, Japan had also given certain assurances on the matter. No sooner, however, did Tsingtau fall into Japanese hands, than voices were raised against

its retrocession. The well-known and influential paper the *Jiji* quoted a "responsible official in Tokyo" as declaring that the retrocession was conditional on Germany's acceptance of Japan's advice for the return of the territory to China. "Now that Japan has taken Tsingtau by force of arms," this official urged, "the position is materially changed, and the obligation on the part of Japan to return the leased territory to China immediately upon its occupation has disappeared." When the Diet met in December the question of the retrocession of Tsingtau was at once raised. An Opposition member called attention to the statement made by the British Press Bureau indicating that Japan would ultimately return Kiaochau to China, and said that the *Times* had expressed the satisfaction of the British and United States Governments at receiving an assurance from Japan to this effect. Thereupon Viscount Kato, the Foreign Minister, rose and emphatically denied that the Japanese Government had given such an assurance. To add force to his statement, he said he made the denial officially as a Minister of State responsible to the Emperor. He added that representations had been made on the subject of the statement issued by the British Press Bureau, and it was found to have been published under a misapprehension. The question of retrocession was one which it would be time enough to consider when the day came for making peace all round.

These statements are of significance in view of subsequent developments. Within a few weeks of this declaration in the Diet—*i.e.*, on January 18th, 1915—Japan presented to China the famous Twenty-one Demands. Earnest endeavours were made to keep these demands a secret from the world. The Japanese Press was ordered to refrain from any reference whatever to any negotiations in progress with China, and when the news leaked out in Peking it was at first denied in Tokyo. After much negotiation and many protests from the Chinese, Japan finally secured the acceptance of her demands in an amended form, but only by presentation of an ultimatum on May 7th, 1915. During all this time it must be borne in mind that Marquis Okuma was Premier and Viscount Kato Minister for Foreign Affairs. The agreement relating to Kiaochau accepted finally by China was embodied in Identical Notes. That signed by Mr. Hioki on behalf of the Japanese Government runs as follows:—

"In the name of my Government I have the honour to make the following declaration to the Chinese Government:—

"When, after the termination of the present war, the leased territory of Kiaochau Bay is completely left to the free disposal of Japan, the Japanese Government will restore the said leased territory to China under the following conditions:—

"(1) The whole of Kiaochau Bay to be opened as a commercial port.

"(2) A concession under the exclusive jurisdiction of Japan to be established at a place to be designated by the Japanese Government.

"(3) If the foreign Powers desire it, an international concession may be established.

"(4) As regards the disposal to be made of the buildings and

properties of Germany and the conditions and procedure relating thereto, the Japanese Government and the Chinese Government shall arrange the matter by mutual agreement before the restoration."

The issues raised by these conditions will be subsequently considered. It is not my intention to discuss the point whether Japan had the right to dispose of territory held in occupation as a result of the war in which she was in alliance with other Powers; my object is rather to indicate the change of view which took place, doubtless under the pressure of the militarist party, as soon as Japanese arms were successful, and the leased territory of Kiaochau was occupied by Japan.

Marquis Okuma's Cabinet fell in October, 1916, having held office for two years and a-half. One of the charges made against his Ministry by political opponents was that it had dealt in very domineering fashion with China, thus causing friction between the two countries and preventing the natural co-operation that should exist. The most strenuous supporter of this view was Baron Goto, who privately circulated a pamphlet in which he recapitulated the charges made against Japan in her dealings with China. When the Cabinet of Count Terauchi succeeded that of Marquis Okuma, it proclaimed that one of its objects would be the establishment of better relations with the neighbouring Republic, but though for a while there seemed to be some improvement, it cannot be said that the policy adopted in regard to China showed any material change. Before the Okuma Cabinet resigned, Japan and Russia had entered into a public treaty, in which they individually and jointly undertook not to join any political arrangement or combination directed against either of the signatory parties, the avowed object of the treaty being the maintenance of the peace of the Far East. As the result of revelations made at Petrograd, it became known subsequently that at the time of the signature of the public treaty the two Powers entered into a secret treaty which showed material differences from the public instrument. While the public treaty professed to aim at a lasting peace in the Far East, and made no specific reference to China, the secret treaty was avowedly for the purpose of safeguarding China against the political domination of any third Power entertaining hostile designs towards Russia or Japan. It was, in effect, a military alliance between the two Powers for the protection of their "vital interests" in China. Though Russia was at this time a member of the *Entente* and engaged in making war in common with the other members, and though Japan was a member of the same Alliance and had special relations with Great Britain, the two Powers considered it necessary to provide in Article 6 that "the present Convention shall be kept in complete secrecy from everybody except the two high contracting parties."

The secret treaty was published in Petrograd by the Bolsheviks towards the end of 1917, apparently with the object of demonstrating that the *Entente*, equally with the Central Powers, were engaged in schemes for territorial aggrandisement. Among the other documents published at the time were reports of conversations between the late Viscount Motono (formerly Japanese Ambassador

at Petrograd, and Foreign Minister in the Terauchi Cabinet) and M. Krupensky, the Russian Ambassador at Tokyo. One of these conversations indicates very clearly the attitude of the Japanese Government concerning the leased territory of Kiaochau. On February 8th, 1917, M. Krupensky reported to his Government that he had had a conversation with Viscount Motono, in which he had urged that Japan should co-operate with the other Allied Powers in bringing pressure to bear on China to join the *Entente* and declare war against Germany. Viscount Motono did not show himself very enthusiastic, but he promised that he would sound the attitude of Peking with the object of ascertaining if China would be likely to yield to such a representation. His hesitation is easily explicable. To the Japanese Foreign Minister it was clear that if China became a belligerent, she would have the same right as Japan to a seat at the Peace Conference, and would discuss the subject of Tsingtau on an equal footing with Japan. He therefore thought it expedient that if possible the question should be practically settled beforehand. After explaining Viscount Motono's view regarding the proposed accession of China to the *Entente*, M. Krupensky's despatch proceeds: "On the other hand, the Minister pointed out the necessity for him, in view of the attitude of Japanese public opinion on the subject, as well as with a view to safeguard Japan's position at the future Peace Conference, if China should be admitted to it, of securing the support of the Allied Powers to the desires of Japan in respect of Shantung and the Pacific Islands. These desires are for the succession to all the rights and privileges hitherto possessed by Germany in the Shantung province and for the acquisition of the islands to the north of the Equator which are now occupied by the Japanese. Motono plainly told me that the Japanese Government would like to receive at once the promise of the Imperial (Russian) Government to support the above desires of Japan." In other words, Japan was to withdraw her opposition to China entering the war as one of the Allies, with a seat at the Conference table, if the Allied Powers would first intimate that they would make the appearance of China at that Conference a nullity. Asked in the Diet whether M. Krupensky's despatch was an accurate record of the conversation, Viscount Motono refused to confirm or deny it.

III.

Of late the Japanese appear to have entertained some doubt whether the Powers would be likely to accede to Japan's wishes in respect of Shantung. In the course of an article in a popular Japanese magazine on Japan's prospects at the Peace Conference, Dr. Terao, formerly a professor at the Tokyo Imperial University and well known for his chauvinist views, says "it is unfortunate that the return of Tsingtau to China was clearly declared by Japan at the outset—i.e., when an ultimatum was sent to Germany—and the best Japan can do now will be to induce China to convert the place into an open port and give Japan the police administration of the city." That is to say, China is nominally to be the sovereign Power, but the actual administration is to be in the hands of Japan. The difference between this arrangement and the holding of

Tsingtau on lease would be difficult to discover. Dr. Terao, who is known as one of the Jingo professors, is not a person of much influence, but the view which he advances is substantially that set forth in the Twenty-one Demands submitted to China by Marquis Okuma's Cabinet, which took shape, so far as the leased territory of Kiaochau is concerned, in the agreement which has been already quoted. The four points of the agreement are worth discussion in the light of information obtained at Tsingtau.

The first proposal is that the whole of Kiaochau Bay is to be regarded as a commercial port. This must be read with the second condition, that a concession under the exclusive jurisdiction of Japan shall be established at a place to be designated by the Japanese Government. Now, the part of Tsingtau which the Japanese propose should be so designated includes all the revenue-producing areas. Tsingtau, it may be explained, occupies a small peninsula, the apex of which is the residential quarter, while the business section is situated on the broader part beyond which extends the former German reservation of Kiaochau, thence merging into the Chinese territory of Shantung. According to a map which has been prepared, the Customs, harbour, wharf, and railway terminus would be all in the Japanese concession, which would be still further extended by a reclamation from the sea adjoining the properties at present owned by the Asiatic Petroleum Company and the Standard Oil Company, these companies having been already approached and offered substantial compensation with the grant of other pieces of land.

It will be observed that Condition 3 proposes that an International Settlement may be established if the Powers desire it, but the Japanese are to have the privilege of first designating a settlement under exclusive Japanese control. The part that it is proposed to leave open for such an International Settlement is the residential quarter, without business facilities or any means of raising revenue other than might be derived from a house or poll tax. It would, it is true, contain the present railway station : but as the Japanese propose to make the main station on ground which, as already mentioned, it is intended to reclaim, the result would be that all the freight traffic would be in Japanese hands and the present railway station would become a mere passenger depôt. In these circumstances the proposal of an International Settlement is illusory. With the Customs, wharf, and railway in the hands of the Japanese, the International Settlement would wither away and die of inanition. But its prospects are even worse than appear at first sight. The slaughter-house—a thriving concern with a large export trade—and the electric light works are within the area set apart for the International Settlement, but as these were Government concerns under the German *régime* they would be subject to the fourth condition, which evidently means that by arrangement with China they would come into Japanese possession. In the same way the substantial Government administrative offices and court-houses, the prison, official residences, observatory, school, &c., also in the residential quarter, would pass into Japanese hands. Moreover, large purchases of former German property in the

residential section are already being made by Japanese, who, by the time an International Settlement was formed, would be in a position to control it as well as that apportioned as an exclusive Japanese concession.

The impression produced upon one who carefully considers the position at Tsingtau is that the Japanese administrators of the port believe they have come to stay. Even were the nominal control to be restored to China, with heavy compensation for the large amount of expenditure lavished upon the port, Japanese interests are so deeply rooted that Japan would be in a position of domination. The new district to which reference has already been made, which contains the licensed quarters as well as shops and business offices, is erected on what is fiscal land, and was formerly occupied by two large brick factories whose leases expired in December, 1914. Thereupon the property was sold or leased to a syndicate and the construction of the new quarter commenced, some million yen being expended. On a part of this ground substantial buildings have been erected, or are in process of being built by important Japanese firms with Government connections. The passing of these lands into Japanese hands thus represents an accomplished fact. The land was fiscal—*i.e.*, it was held by the German Government with a view of gradually leasing it as the town developed, the rents derived forming a means of recouping the expenditure on the port. The Japanese authorities have granted leases of these lands at purely nominal rates, and always to Japanese, to the exclusion of Europeans and Americans. The term is said to be for ten years, but it is difficult to believe that solid and imposing buildings would be erected by semi-Government organisations and others without a confident belief in the ultimate control of Tsingtau by Japan and the endorsement of the grants made. When the extension and development of the port under the Japanese is considered, together with the building construction in progress, altogether out of proportion to present or prospective needs—when such tendencies are noted as the re-naming of the streets, plans of reclamation that will occupy years in completion, the disposal of fiscal lands, the purchase of German private property, then the cumulative inference from such facts concerning Japan's intentions would seem fairly conclusive.

Another question that is raised with regard to the future is the ownership of the Shantung Railway. This line was built by a private German company, and when Tsingtau surrendered it was taken over by the Japanese on the plea that it had been used for military purposes. Unless China stepped in and asserted her rights it was, of course, inevitable that this should be the case, but it is now asked: What is to be the future of this railway at the peace? During 1917 there was a considerable increase of traffic on the Shantung Railway. Some 705,254 tons of freight were moved, and in the last two years a substantial profit has been made. If the Shantung Railway passes into Japanese hands, together with the German mining and development rights, Japan will acquire the same domination in Shantung that she now possesses in Manchuria. The nominal authority administering Tsingtau would

be immaterial; the real control would be in the hands of Japan. In the agreement respecting the province of Shantung, following on the presentation of the Twenty-one Demands, China consented "to give full assent to all matters upon which the Japanese Government may hereafter agree with the German Government relating to the disposition of all rights, interests, and concessions which Germany, by virtue of treaties or otherwise, possesses in relation to the province of Shantung." These included the railway concessions, and as regarded the railway to be built by China herself from Chefoo or Lungkow to connect with the Kiaochau-Tsinan-fu Railway, China incidentally agreed to approach Japanese capitalists for a loan. According to recent news from Tsinan-fu (the western terminus of the Shantung Railway), China has made certain railway concessions to Japan in Shantung on the understanding that the latter Power withdraws her claim to exercise civil administration at Tsinan. What these concessions are is not clear, but it is to be presumed that they include concessions for feeding lines to the Shantung Railway. Indeed, it is stated that construction work will shortly commence in spite of the protest made by the Chinese Provincial Assembly. If these statements are well founded, the position is of much interest. It is necessary that Chefoo, a real international settlement, should be brought into connection with the Chinese railway system. This can only be done effectively by constructing a line which would join the Shantung Railway at a point a third of the distance from Tsingtau to Tsinan-fu. Now, if the Shantung Railway is to remain in the hands of Japan, the danger exists that, as by far the greater part of the produce comes over the western half of that line, there will be an inducement to give more favourable terms to produce destined for Tsingtau, where the Japanese have built up such extensive interests, than to those granted for Chefoo, where Japanese interests are practically non-existent. Equally it would be a misfortune for Chefoo that the German claims of sole right of railway construction in Shantung should pass to Japan. In saying this it is not necessary to accuse the Japanese of seeking to destroy the interests of other nationals in Shantung. The mere fact that Japanese interests lie chiefly in Tsingtau would naturally lead to attention being concentrated on that part of the railway which would advantage those interests. But the charge is made that even as matters stand there is discrimination made in railway rates in favour of Japanese. It is very difficult to prove such charges, but the belief that there is substantial ground for complaint seems universal among European and American merchants at Tsingtau.

The prosperity of the Shantung Railway is a reflection of the commercial progress at Tsingtau during the last two or three years. For a long time after the siege the Chinese merchants, who much preferred the Germans to the Japanese, virtually boycotted the port, and in consequence the straw-braid business, of which Tsingtau formed the centre, migrated to Chefoo and Tientsin. Gradually the boycott was broken down, and a considerable amount of produce now comes to Tsingtau, while the rise in the price of silver has encouraged the port generally. The foreign trade of the leased

territory in 1917 was only 2 per cent. less on a silver basis than in the year 1913, which had previously held the record, while the gold valuation was 36 per cent. greater. As showing the influence of the Japanese occupation, it is noteworthy that whereas in 1913 41.5 per cent. of the foreign goods imported into Tsingtau came *via* Chinese ports, in 1917 the value of the foreign goods imported *via* those ports was only 24.6 per cent. The trade had meanwhile shifted to Japanese ports. No less than 57.1 per cent. of the total foreign imports during the year were direct shipments from Japan. Similarly as regards exports. In 1913, under German occupation, 52.8 per cent. of the total export trade went through Chinese ports; in 1917 only 35.4 per cent. In 1913 Japan's share of the export trade was 7.9 per cent.; in 1917 it was 59 per cent. Exports were swelled, however, by what may be described as an illegitimate item in the export of copper ingots, derived by melting down Chinese cash of brass and copper. The export of this currency is prohibited by the Chinese Customs regulations, but since the Japanese obtained control the regulation has been treated as if it did not exist, and all protests have been ignored. Factories for the smelting of the cash into ingots exist both in Tsinan, the capital of Shantung province, and in Tsingtau itself, and are operated without hindrance. According to the Customs reports, the export from Tsingtau of these ingots in 1917 totalled 40,231 tons, valued in Haikuan taels 9,355,481. No less than 36 per cent. of the total net exports were of local origin, of which some 2 per cent. went to Chinese ports and the remainder to Japan. It is to be regretted that Japan should permit this trade to be carried on, as it must give cause for suspicion that in other respects Chinese regulations are ignored when they appear to conflict with Japanese interests. Opium, for example, has been largely imported through the leased territory into China Proper, and whether or not there has been actual Japanese connivance in this matter, the copper cash scandal inevitably rouses distrust in the mind of the Chinese.

As already pointed out, the export and import figures show that the course of trade at Tsingtau has changed to the advantage of Japan. Japan has also captured the shipping trade of the port. During 1913 the total tonnage of all vessels clearing from the port was 1,300,442, of which the share of Japan was 222,693 tons; in 1917 it was 1,600,459, of which the Japanese share was 1,114,159 tons. A part of this enormous increase of Japanese tonnage is due doubtless to the withdrawal of foreign tonnage for use in the war, but the principal cause is the diversion of the trade to Japan. The tendency is to bind Tsingtau to Japan while the port is held in occupation, in the belief that trade channels once established will not be very readily diverted. With this object the greatest encouragement has been given to industrial undertakings. It is estimated that during 1917 new Japanese capital was invested in industrial enterprises to the extent of some six million yen, without including the capital supplied by parent companies with head offices elsewhere. Great impetus is given to these industrial enterprises by the utilisation of a German agreement with China under which machinery, implements, and tools required for manufacturing, industrial, and agricultural purposes are imported free of duty.

Machinery can thus be laid down in Tsingtau cheaper than in high-tariffed Japan. Furthermore, the Japanese authorities have encouraged the infant industries by granting sites at little or no cost, despite the fact that Japan's position is only that of a bailee, while raw materials for factories at Tsingtau are conceded low freights over the Shantung Railway.

The result is evident. Japan could return the leased territory to China to-morrow with the certainty that, whatever administrative authority be instituted at Kiaochau, Japanese interests are predominant, and must be taken into consideration in all matters affecting control. If the final arrangement be the granting to Japan of an exclusive Settlement comprising all the revenue-producing utilities, with the creation of an illusory International Settlement doomed to absorption by reason of incapacity to stand alone, Japan will have obtained practically the same position as if the lease had been transferred to her. It is significant of an intention to remain in Tsingtau that a magnificent site is being cleared for the erection of a Shinto temple, for it is scarcely necessary to point out the relation of Shintoism to Japanese national sentiment, especially as this is interpreted by the military party. Japan, in short, has made use of her four years at Tsingtau to create a position in Shantung that will be scarcely affected by the decisions of the Peace Conference. Fiscal lands have been alienated or appropriated at nominal prices. Private interests have been encouraged at the expense of the general welfare. In short, Japan has obtained what is virtually complete control of the leased territory, and can be only expropriated at ruinous compensation. To Japanese militarists the organisation and success of the scheme is due, but it is the Japanese Government and people who must bear the responsibility.

So far no criticism of these proceedings has appeared from the pen of a Japanese publicist. It would be wrong to conclude, however, that such methods have the unhesitating support of the Japanese people. In Japan national selfishness and self-sufficiency are as powerful factors as elsewhere, but the beginnings of self-criticism are also evident. Mr. Ozaki, who occupied the post of Minister of Justice in the Okuma Cabinet, and who is an opponent of militarism, has recently ventured to say a word for elevating the moral standard of international politics. He urges that Japan's participation in the war would be quite meaningless if she were merely absorbed at the Peace Conference in the settlement of petty problems from no higher motive than that of serving her own selfish interests. There are eminent Japan publicists who survey international politics from a similarly elevated standpoint. But of criticism of a concrete example of national acquisitiveness such as is exhibited at Tsingtau there is no sign. It is unfortunate that this should be so, as it is Japan who will suffer from the international suspicion aroused when the facts become known, as must be the case when the final settlement is made. And Japan and the Japanese have so many good qualities that such a result is to be regretted. Militarism in Japan as in Germany, in the Far East as in Europe, works infinite evil.

ROBERT YOUNG,
Editor *Japan Chronicle*.

CHINA AT THE PEACE CONFERENCE.

THE Conference now sitting in Paris deals not only with many problems that have arisen between the two groups of belligerents since the war, but also with principles and rules to be introduced and discussed to govern the future conduct of affairs between different States. At the Conference, China, as a co-belligerent of the Allies, will present her claims against the enemy; such as the disposition of her merchant ships captured in her ports when she declared war, and the compensation by him of the loss of life and property suffered by her seamen and labourers employed in legitimate occupations on board Allied or neutral ships and in Allied countries. On these points she will no doubt take concerted action with the Allies, and it is hoped that whatever compensation is appropriated to them will be extended to her in proportion to her loss.

As to indemnity, she will not demand any. She has not been a very active partner in the prosecution of the war, and has dispatched no army to any theatre of war, except a few contingents to the Russo-Manchurian frontier for the maintenance of order, and for the protection of the line of communication between Vladivostok and the Allied Armies of intervention in Siberia. She has not suffered much at the hands of the Germans, and in consequence has only a very small bill to settle with them. Moreover, she did not enter the war with any hope of self-aggrandisement, and desires no illegitimate share of the spoil to be exacted from Germany (if such there is to be).

In fact, she is more interested in the world settlement—that is to emerge from the Conference—than in the gain and loss to any particular country. She is interested in it, not only because of her love of principles of liberty and justice, but also because of its inevitable effect on her internal situation. Scientific inventions have destroyed the distance between different countries, and it is no longer possible for her to maintain her splendid isolation. The political and financial institutions in Peking and in the Provinces are constantly influenced by events abroad, and by the policy pursued by the Great Powers towards China. At present she is introducing the Western system of Government and the Western means of production on a large scale with the object of reorganising her social and economic systems, so as to meet changes in environment. Should she be made immune from any threat of conquest or subjugation by means suggested by President Wilson, such as open diplomacy and disarmament, she would develop herself in such a way as to adapt Western sciences and scientific methods to her own civilisation. If, on the other hand, the biological conception of "struggle for supremacy" remains the principle of European diplomacy in China after the war, she may find it impossible to organise her armed force in time for her self-defence, and may be forced by circumstances to place herself under the guardianship of some more forceful and better organised Power. In that event, not only will her independence become a shadow, but the world

would become impoverished by the suppression of its most ancient and most original civilisation.

In view of the close relations that exist between the future of International relationships (which will be shaped at the Peace Conference) and the future of China, it is essential to examine her attitude towards a League of Nations, the establishment of which is one of the objects to be achieved by the statesmen assembling at the Quai d'Orsay. In this connection, it should be said that although China has made no official declaration committing herself to such a League, she, judged by her past activities in promoting the welfare of mankind—such as the representation at the two Hague Conferences and many International Unions, and the signature to most of their Conventions—will no doubt approve of the scheme, and do her best to make it successful and effective. Moreover, to be consistent, she should testify by deeds the words she employed in her reply to Mr. Wilson's Peace Note of January 3rd, 1917. In the reply she said that "... China cannot but show satisfaction with the views of the Government and people of the United States of America who declare themselves ready, and even eager, to co-operate when the war is over, by all proper means, to assure the respect of the principle of the equality of nations, whatever their power may be, and to relieve them of the peril of wrong and violence," and that "China is ready to join her efforts with theirs for the attainment of such results which can only be obtained through the help of all"; and it is in her adhesion and support to the ideas of a League of Nations that she can give a proof of the sincerity of her statement.

Nations may be equal before the law; but in diplomacy, equality of States is a legal fiction. They differ in civilisation, in the extent of territory and population, and in the stage of development. So far as territory and population are concerned, China is a Great Power, but owing to her material impotence and the undevelopedness of her economic resources, she cannot be expected to undertake the same responsibility as Great Britain or the United States for the maintenance of international peace and the enforcement of international covenants, which are the chief functions of the League. In consequence, she will probably not be accorded the same voting power as Great Britain, France, Japan, or the United States. But, on the other hand, it should be noted that the question of China may assume a much greater importance in the future than in the past, and she should then be assigned a position in the Council of the League appropriate to the part she plays in international politics. Moreover, though she is unable to contribute much to the League in the way of military forces for the enforcement of its constitution, she has a very powerful weapon in her hand in the shape of economic boycott against any State that commits violence. The power of this economic weapon should not be estimated by the volume of her foreign trade, as it is only £170,000,000 a year, but by the willingness and effectiveness with which she exercises it—as may be seen in her boycott against the United States in 1906 for its exclusion of Chinese labourers, and against Japan in 1915

for her pressure on the Chinese Government, forcing the acceptance of her twenty-one demands, which, if accepted without modification, would have established a Japanese Protectorate over China. These boycotts were maintained with remarkable persistency and proved very effective as a means of exacting justice from the two States concerned. Should she consent to enforce economic boycott for the service of the League, she would contribute a good deal towards its consolidation. She should on that account be entitled to a considerable voting power—not so great as that of Great Britain or the United States, perhaps, but much greater than that assigned to the Low Countries, the Scandinavian States, or the Balkan Kingdoms, with whom she was classified on the same level at the second Hague Conference.

So much for China's attitude towards the general policy of the Peace Conference, but she has problems of her own which she hopes to settle with the Allies. First, there is the question relating to the disposition of the Kiaochow Bay leased to Germany before it was captured by Japan on November 27th, 1914. In the Note exchanged with China on May 25th, 1915, Japan pledged to restore it to China on the following conditions, provided she is granted a free disposal of the leased territory. These conditions are :—

1. The whole of the Kiaochow Bay to be opened as a commercial port.
2. A concession under the exclusive jurisdiction of Japan to be established at a place designated by the Japanese Government.
3. If the foreign Powers desire it, an international concession may be established.

These conditions were as binding on Japan as on China, but they are now subject to alteration because of the fact that since they were agreed upon China, through her declaration of war on Germany and the abrogation of all treaties with her, has acquired the right to participate in the negotiations between Germany and Japan. It will be a matter of agreement between China and Japan as to whether these conditions should now be made operative without alteration. To promote good will and friendship with Japan, it may be advisable for China to adhere to these conditions as far as possible. Moreover, Kiaochow Bay having been an open port for twenty years, it will be her interest to maintain it in that status. But there need be no concession exclusively under the Japanese jurisdiction side by side with an international concession, as contemplated in the conditions quoted above. A concession remains Chinese territory, pays land tax to the territorial sovereign, and confers on the Power to which it is granted no territorial acquisition. The sole object of a concession being to provide foreign residents with security and comfort which are not obtainable under the Chinese administration, an international concession with equal rights of self-government for residents of all nationalities will give the Japanese all the things they can expect to get from a concession of their own. In fact, all the concessions of different Powers in a

treaty port should be amalgamated into an international concern, and Kiaochow should be made the first settlement of this new type.

In some parts of Shantung which have never been leased to Germany, Japan has stationed troops and established civil service centres on the pretext of protecting the Tsintau-Tsinanfu Railway. The contact of the uninvited guests with the local soldiers and policemen has already produced conflict, and their intrusion is not defensible by treaty or by their claims to inherit rights formerly enjoyed by the Germans. It is hoped that the Conference, through a special commission, will examine the case, and request the Japanese to withdraw from these districts, when the restoration of Kiaochow to China has been accomplished and its military occupation by Japan has come to an end.

China, by her treaty with Japan dated May 25th, 1915, has granted Japanese subjects the right to reside, to travel, to trade, and to engage in all industrial and agricultural enterprises in South Manchuria. According to her treaties with other States she should extend the most-favoured-nation treatment to all their subjects, and should, therefore, grant them the same right in South Manchuria as that enjoyed by the Japanese. But during the past four years Japan has built up her influence to such an extent that China seems to be powerless to accord them these rights in the region under consideration. It will be to the advantage of China, as well as to that of her Treaty States, if the attention of the Conference is called to the actual state of affairs in South Manchuria, and adequate means be found to maintain the principle of equal opportunity for all nations.

The restoration of Kiaochow would, of course, put an end to the lease to Germany, but there remains lease of territory to other countries—that of Wei-hai-wei to Great Britain, that of Kwangchow-wan to France, and that of Port Arthur and Dalny to Japan. The *raison-d'être* of these leases was that different Powers objected to the dominance in China of any single Power, and in consequence occupied strategic points and naval stations to balance each other.

The principle of "balance of power" has now been discredited, and time seems to be ripe for Great Britain and France to renounce their lease, provided they are guaranteed that commercial interests and economic opportunities in China will not suffer thereby. Moreover, Japan has become so dominant in her leased territory that it would be impossible for Great Britain and France to compete with her even though they retain their lease. This would neutralise the effect of the balance of power. The best remedy against this danger is that Great Britain and France should first prove their disinterestedness by renouncing their leases, and then help China to demand of Japan a retrocession of her leased territory. For the sake of promoting the commercial interests of all nations, the territory thus restored should be opened to trade by China herself.

Should it happen that the Allies fail to agree on this proposal, China should then demand that the legal status of leased territory should be defined, so as to avoid any conflict in the future similar

to that with Japan during her military operations against Tsingtau, in the course of which she violated the neutrality of China. It should be provided in the treaties with the lessee that as China retains her sovereign rights over it the territory leased is not liable to attack. In short, what has been considered as the legal status of concessions and settlements in treaty ports should be made applicable to leased territory. In the Supplementary Convention to the Treaty with the United States of 1858, it is said that "no such concession or grant shall be construed to give to any Power or party which may be at war with or hostile to the United States the right to attack the citizens of the United States or their property within the said land or waters," and that "the United States, for themselves, hereby agree to abstain from offensively attacking the citizens or subjects of any Power or party or their property with which they may be at war on any such tract of land or waters of the said Empire (China)." In making these conditions applicable to leased territory, it should also be stipulated that as the sole object of lease is to give the lessee a coaling station, the lessee should be denied the right to fortify it or station troops therein.

Before the total abolition of extra-territorial jurisdiction, China must have her laws re-codified, her prisons reformed, and a large body of judges trained, capable of carrying out judicial administration with efficiency and honesty, so as to make themselves trusted by foreign Powers. At present China is moving rapidly in that direction, but it will be some time before her reforms are executed with satisfaction in every part of the country. It may be proposed at the Conference that in Peking and in a few other towns in China, where the performance of judicial duty has been entrusted to well-trained judges, and prisons on modern sanitary lines have been built, the Chinese Courts should exercise jurisdiction not only over mixed cases in which the defendant is Chinese, as they do at present, but also over mixed cases where either party is Chinese, whether as defendant or as plaintiff. For the first five years or so the jurisdiction should be restricted to mixed cases, but if these Courts prove themselves competent, it should be extended to cases between foreigners of one or more nationalities; the codes to be administered will be the temporary new codes now in force in China.

If the Powers insist that they cannot, as yet, see their way to giving full confidence to Chinese judges, a compromise may be reached by allowing a representative from the Consulate of the foreigner involved in the case to sit in the Chinese Courts as Assessor. He will be entitled to give advice to the Chinese judges, and to make complaints against any injustice to the said Consulate or the diplomatic representative of his country in Peking. In the event of the complaints being very serious, the trial may be handed over to the Consulate. Again, if the Powers are so distrustful of the Chinese judges as to refuse to consider even this compromise, a further concession may be made by China. She may suggest that she should employ foreign judges to sit in her reformed Courts to try cases in which the defendant is not Chinese. These judges

will be appointed and dismissible by her, and their jurisdiction will be extended to cases between foreigners of one or more nationalities and to mixed cases in which the defendant is a foreigner (although the plaintiff is Chinese), but it will not be extended to mixed cases in which the defendant is Chinese. The employment of foreign judges by China in her new Courts will not only give foreigners adequate guarantee against any possible injustice from inexperienced Chinese judges, but will also give the Chinese in the judicial service a chance to learn more of the European way of administering justice. Courts will then be a training ground for Chinese judges.

The existing tariff was fixed at the uniform rate of 5 per cent. *ad valorem* on all imports. Imports from a treaty port to the interior and exports from the interior to a treaty port for shipment abroad are exempted from all inland charges including *li-kin*, on the payment of a transit duty at the half-tariff rate, that is to say, at $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. The inland charges, especially *li-kin*, though not levied on imports and exports, are a great hindrance to the development of trade. This has been long foreseen by the Chinese Government, and it has already undertaken to abolish all *li-kin* barriers in its treaties with Great Britain, with Japan, and with the United States, concluded in 1902-3. At the Conference China should renew her undertaking to abolish *li-kin* as soon as the internal situation permits. In return for abolition, Great Britain, France, the United States, and Japan should be requested to consent to a restoration of fiscal independence to China, giving her the right to impose a tariff and alter it in any way she thinks fit without going through the elaborate process of treaty revision. The chief reason for the denial of this right to her is that as her Custom receipts are mortgaged for foreign loans and indemnity, foreign investors are afraid of a diminution of these receipts, should China be allowed to adjust her tariff—a diminution that would undermine the security of their bonds. This fear will be quelled if China commits herself not to alter her tariff in such a way as to cause its yield below the quota required for the annual redemption of loans and indemnities mortgaged on its receipts.

The topics so far dealt with cover most of the claims China might make at the Conference. Owing to internal disturbance and financial stringency she has not been able to render much active assistance to the Allies, and in consequence does not expect much from them in the way of reward. But she is not neglectful, as she has supplied a large number of labourers. Moreover, this Conference is not only a post-bellum assembly in the ordinary sense; it involves the reconstruction of the whole world, and is intended to distribute justice to all nations, great or small alike. It will be a justice to China if her claims are sympathetically considered by the Allies.

S. G. CHENG.

[Since this article was written China has officially pledged her support to the League, and one of her Delegates to the Peace Conference is a member of the Commission in charge of the drafting of the Constitution just published.]

THE PAPACY AND THE WAR.

BENEDICTUS *qui venit in nomine Domini!* was the acclamation with which the wisest and best men in the Catholic Church welcomed the accession of the present Pope. Under Pius X. the prestige of the Holy See had fallen. The romance of his peasant origin, his personal piety, and his simple ways was evanescent. These qualities, while they should not exclude a man from the Chair of St. Peter, are insufficient qualifications for it. Celestine V. possessed them; and, though he was a saint, he was an impossible Pope. Nor did the administrative reforms of the late pontificate, some of which were in the right direction, outweigh its two irretrievable disasters—the breach with scholarship and the break with France. The election of Benedict XV. was intended to mark a change of policy. The ends in view were, indeed, unchanged—in the case of the Papacy they are unchangeable; but they were to be pursued by other means. No one expected the new Pope to go back upon the condemnation of Modernism, or thought that the Concordat of 1801 could be re-established. But it was believed that his measures would be healing, and that a man of his character and traditions would make short work with the *peripsema omnium* which had made the Vatican a byword in his predecessor's reign. Had it not been for the outbreak of the war, these aspirations might have been realised. But the fountains of the deep were opened. Who now thought either of Modernism, or of the Concordat? The ship of the Church was swept out of land-locked waters into a tempestuous sea. Had Benedict XV. escaped shipwreck, he would have shown not only that he was a statesman of the first rank, but that the Papacy was still a living force in human affairs. Only those who so regard it can be surprised that it broke down under the test to which it was exposed.

2. That it did break down is beyond question. The attitude of the Vatican during the war has been marked by a radical and incurable incapacity to discern its real nature. For Benedict XV. it was a war like other wars; to be brought to an end, as they have been brought to an end, by a compromise. He could not see that it was a conflict of ideas, not of interests: of Democracy he knew, and wished to know, nothing; his sympathies were with the old monarchies, which he believed to be very much stronger and more stable than they were. His mentality was that of a past generation; he moved among ghosts, and was himself a survival in a new world. It has been urged that he followed the traditional policy of his predecessors. If the Popes of the Decadence are meant, this is true. It is not true, if we go back to those of the Heroic Age of the Papacy: not so did they conceive their office or envisage their time. The great Mediæval Pontiffs—the Gregories, the Leos, the Innocents—would have faced the man whose lawless ambition let loose these horrors upon humanity with a pride equal to and a resolution greater than his own. They were neither hand-to-mouth politicians, nor milk-and-water pietists. They believed that the thunder of heaven was at their disposition, and they called it down

on evil-doers—"to deliver such an one to Satan for the destruction of the flesh." But it is a long way from the thirteenth century to the twentieth. The Pope is a shadow of his former self, and retains a shadow of his former authority; it would be unreasonable to expect him to use a weapon which would break in his hands. But there is more than one middle term between theocracy and eclipse; to play the part of Meroz was not even to fight "after the manner of men." A casuist could no doubt make a case for it; for what can a casuist not make a case? How, it was asked, could the common Father take sides in a war which divided his children? a spiritual ruler intervene in temporal matters? a passionless priest touch life to the quick? weigh evidence? sit in judgment? acquit or condemn? No: he would stand aside, mitigating the horrors of war where occasion offered; he would pray, exhort to forgiveness, and plead for peace.

3. Great place carries with it great responsibility. Popes are, indeed, human.

"God so willed;
Mankind is ignorant, a man am I;
Call ignorance my sorrow, not my sin!"

But a Pope who disclaims temporal jurisdiction "doth protest too much." Politics are a branch of Ethics; and to those who take the Papacy seriously such an attitude will seem one of abdication: a teacher is set to teach, a judge to adjudicate, a ruler to rule. But the "neutrality" of the Vatican was a pretext. The remarkable articles which appeared in the *Revue de Paris* (October 15th and November 1st, 1918) under the title of "La Politique de Benoit XV." make it clear that Rome was not neutral. The Pope was an active ally of the Central Powers; and must share in whatever obloquy attaches to them by reason of their inception and conduct of the war. The papers recently published by the Bavarian Government bring this into even stronger relief. It is impossible that the Nuncio at Munich should have been in ignorance of the state of affairs. He may, or may not, have been directly consulted; but it was his business to have access to sources of information and to know what was going on. That the details were not communicated to the Pope in person is possible. There are precedents for the exercise of reserve in such matters: in 1583 the Nuncio at Paris wrote to the Papal Secretary with regard to one of the many assassination-plots directed against Queen Elizabeth—"as to putting to death that wicked woman. I will not write about it to our Lord the Pope; because, though I believe that he would be glad that God should punish in any way whatever that enemy of His, still it would be unfitting that His Vicar should procure it by these means." Such ignorance, however, is characterised by theologians as *affectata*. The Pope was not, in so many words, told of it; but the Holy See was informed.

4. The conclusions at which the writer in the *Revue de Paris*—whose name is an open secret—arrives, and which he justifies not only by direct appeal to documents, but by that indirect and cumulative evidence (not to be confounded with hearsay) which is derived from personal knowledge of the men and the milieu, is:—

1. That the Pope, being determined to regard the war as no more than a vulgar rivalry of ambitions, refused from the first to admit the criminality of the violation of Belgian neutrality; and would not allow either that the Allies had any advantage over their opponents in the matter of justice, or that the methods of war adopted by Germany differed morally from theirs.

2. That, in consequence, as he considered our ambitions more dangerous and more tenacious than those of Germany, he did not scruple to urge the United States to prohibit the exportation of arms and munitions of war; and to use his influence, not only with neutrals to dissuade them from joining the Allies, but over Catholics in the Allied countries to induce them to break up the alliance, and to detach themselves from the common bond.

Whether this was right or wrong is matter of opinion. But it is matter of fact that it went beyond neutrality. To act in this way was to take an active part for the one and against the other side.

5. When the author of the *Life of Bishop Wilberforce* was blamed for his indiscreet revelations, his answer was: "You should have seen what I left out." The writer of "*La Politique de Benoit XV.*" might make a similar reply to his critics. Nor, he tells us, would he have written even what he has, were it not that of late years the maxim *sentire cum ecclesia* has been extended from religion to politics, and the Church identified with the Pope. "*On ne limite pas le champ où le pape peut et doit exercer sa volonté,*" said Pius X. The formal utterances of his predecessors are with him. "Each of the two swords, the spiritual and the temporal, is in the power of the Church," is the assertion of the Bull *Unam Sanctam*; and when the present Pope urged peace by negotiation upon the belligerents (August, 1917) a French bishop insisted that Catholics, as such, were under an obligation in conscience "to take into serious consideration the solution which their spiritual Head regarded as identified with the highest good of mankind." Given the premisses, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion. "*On ne marche pas avec la vérité.*" Can a theocracy admit reserves? Is infallibility in faith and morals compatible with fallibility in politics? If a Pope can be in the wrong where his assertions can be tested, why should we believe him where they cannot? Our author answers these questions as a Catholic must. But the moderation of his language does but throw a stronger light on the moral and intellectual mediocrity of the Pontiff. And the judgment of a very shrewd observer is: "*Entre toutes les abdications qui maintenant pleuvent, celle de Benoit XV. ne serait pas le moins souhaitable pour le bien commun et même pour l'avantage de l'église catholique.*"

6. The answer that has been made to the *Revue de Paris* is that "*La Politique de Benoit XV.*" is mere gossip; that the Acts of the Holy See breathe the spirit of conciliation, and take purely religious ground. This is at once true and false. The public pronouncements of the Holy See are exoteric. Their wording is ambiguous, and requires determination. However different their circumstances, there is a family likeness between them; they deal in generalities and platitudes and conventional phrase. To get at their meaning

one must be behind the scenes. "Vous avez trop vu le dessous des cartes," it was said to a dissatisfied convert to Romanism. It will not, perhaps, bear too close an inspection; but the real thing, the *Vera Roma*, is there. So that an acquaintance with the *coulisses* is essential.

"Ce n'est donc pas assez, pour connaître l'attitude du Saint-Siège et comprendre le développement de sa politique internationale, de s'en tenir, comme il le prétend, à ses documents officiels. La vérité est plus complexe et plus fuyante; et c'est à travers un mouvant dédale de déclarations contradictoires, d'aveux et de réticences, d'indiscrétions et de mensonges, qu'il faut suivre pas à pas ses traces incertaines, si l'on veut enfin la saisir."

7. Keen-sighted as it is over small concrete present issues, the Papacy of to-day is incapable of anything like long views. In dealing with ideas, it invariably miscalculates; in conflict with national sentiment, it is invariably defeated. The intervention of Leo XIII. in Ireland—in the Plan of Campaign, and in the Parnell tribute—was unsuccessful; and when, during the South African War, the Continental clerical press launched a combined offensive against this country, the English Catholics made no secret of their sentiments. They were English first, and Catholics afterwards; the Vatican, though chagrined, withdrew. The issues of the war of 1914-18 were clearer; nor was Benedict likely to succeed where Leo had failed. And though the reproach directed by Pascal against the Jesuits, "Toutes vos démarches sont politiques," may be addressed to him, he is, it seems, a poor politician. In the von Gerlach case he was the dupe of an adventurer of the shabbiest type; nor was this a solitary instance: hence political as well as moral bankruptcy—from which he remains, and seems likely to remain, undischarged. What has been described as "the grave incident of the prayers for peace"—(February, 1915)—was an example. To pray for peace is well; our English Prayer Book does so daily, as do the Catholic service books on which it is based. But the direction given to these particular prayers showed that the Pope either did not understand, or disapproved and wished the French Church to disavow, the conviction of the country as to the war. This was that it was one of self-defence, and for the maintenance of the public law of Europe; and that it was being fought by the Allies with clean hands. Here the nation was united and enthusiastic. To strike a jarring note would have been to kill French Catholicism; the bishops could not, dared not, comply. But interpretation is a magic wand. By an audacious stroke, they presented the pacificism of the Pope in military uniform and with a fanfare of trumpets. It had the resonance of a shout for victory—"The sword of the Lord and of Gideon": only in one way could peace be restored, or could its restoration be desirable—by the triumph of right. Great was the indignation behind the Bronze Portal. The Pope sheltered himself under the ambiguity. The term Right was equivocal:—

"Who the Pretender is, and who the King—
God bless us all!—is quite another thing."

But the clerical press raved. Never, even in religious journalism, had the issues of right and wrong been brushed aside with such insolent cynicism; never had the hierarchy of a historical Church been addressed in such a strain. The inheritors of the tradition of Bossuet and Fénelon were sent to school beyond the Rhine: they had much to learn, they were told, from the "grave and serious piety of the German bishops." Had the Vatican scribe lived under Nebuchadnezzar, he would have exhorted the Three Children, we may believe, to take example by the docile Babylonian prelates, who "fell down and worshipped the golden image" which their pious Emperor had set up.

"The French complain of injustice. What is this injustice? and on which side is the wrong? It is France, Eminence"—it is the Cardinal Archbishop of Paris who is addressed—"which has trodden divine and human law alike under foot by her legislation against the Religious Orders. Who has brought trouble upon Belgium? England and France, who, for their own profit, have bought up the Government of that unhappy country. Who has put its priests, its women, its children to the sword? War is war"—it is the Prussian plea for frightfulness, *Krieg ist Krieg*—"and, had the Belgian priests kept within the limits of Christian prudence they would not have been killed. And it is you, who, with your colleague Mercier, have abased your dignity as Cardinals and your office as Bishops by exhorting your flocks not to piety, resignation, and forgiveness, but to indignation, hatred, and revenge. The German Bishops see in the war the punishment due to sin; the French an aggression and an iniquity. The future will show for which of the two God will decide. But, most Eminent Lord, is it not in your opinion possible that the victory of France would be the victory of impiety and immorality? A victory for your hybrid Allies—England, Italy, America—the eternal enemies of the Church? Do you not know that this is the one reason why the sympathy of the worst elements in the neutral nations is enlisted on your side?"

So the pamphlet signed *Benedetto Governa*—i.e., Benedict is the Ruler. And—"c'est parmi les plus intimes confidants du pontife qu'il en faut chercher l'origine."

8. And now—*Dextera Domini fecit virtutem*. History has decided—and against the Pope. No wise or good man will attempt to make controversial capital out of this. The Church of Luther is, indeed, "in the same condemnation"; it is, perhaps, not in the Churches that the best mind and conscience of our age are to be found. It is well, indeed, that no representative of the Pope should sit at the Peace Conference; and that what was once known as the Roman question should rest in its dishonoured grave. But that what is, after all, the greatest of the Christian Churches should be weakened—and the Papacy is so closely identical with the Latin Church that what is loss to the one is loss also to the other—this is not matter for congratulation. The moral forces at the disposition of mankind are neither so many nor so strong that we can afford to

see the disappearance of what was once one of them with indifference:

“Men are we, and must grieve when even the Shade
Of that which once was great is passed away.”

9. To those who take the Ultramontane view of the Papacy the situation must be embarrassing. For it is not a matter of human frailty. If it were, it would be explicable: men are men. But Benedict XV. is neither an Alexander VI. nor a Julius II.: he is personally a virtuous, a benevolent, and a humane man. It would be unjust to suppose him indifferent to suffering, careless either of the horrors of war or of the interests of peace. He has done much—more probably than appears on the surface—to alleviate distress, to ameliorate the lot of prisoners, and to relieve strain. But, when a man assumes the part of God, that is not enough. The gravamen against him is not that he was wanting in humanity—this was not the case; but that he fell so lamentably short of any, even the loosest, conception of what the Vicar of Christ and the Vice-Gerent of Deity should be. The impossible is not to be expected: God did not, the Pope could not, “stop the war.” But, were he what he claims to be, he would apprehend moral issues, discern the quality of human action, test the respective values of conflicting ideas. He would refrain from men of blood—“O my soul, come not thou into their secret!”; he would expose falsehood, rebuke oppression, denounce crime. He might have done these things; and he did not. “When thou sawest a thief, thou consentedst unto him.” This is the tragedy of his reign; the bankruptcy of his office; the refutation of the conception of religion for which he stands.

10. This conception is, indeed, *frappé de caducité*; the Papacy, its most representative institution, belongs to a world that has passed away. It survives in virtue of its association with a religion which, if mixed—and what religion is not mixed?—is still living. But this association is one of incompatibles; from the first the spiritual element in the Church has chafed both under the alliance and under the compromises which it involved. Far as controversy was from the writer’s mind—or rather just because it was so—there is no more illuminative book on the Papacy than Bryce’s “Holy Roman Empire”: the Pope is the Cæsar, the Church is the Empire, in the modern world. To speak of either—the Empire or the Church—as Holy is, no doubt, a misnomer; but both are Roman and Imperial. Each has done good work in its time, though each has outlived its usefulness: the two, the World-Monarchy and the World-Church, are legacies left by ancient civilisation to the barbarism which swept it away. And the two are one. When Boniface VIII. presented himself sceptred and crowned, at the Jubilee of 1300, with the cry, *Ego, ego sum Imperator*, the Papacy, if only for a moment, realised its ideal of universal dominion, “All power is given to me in heaven and in earth.”

“The Holy Roman Church and the Holy Roman Empire are one and the same thing seen from different sides. Catholicism, the

principle of the universal Christian society, is also Romanism . . . and it matters little whether we call the Pope a spiritual Emperor, or the Emperor a secular Pope."

There was, no doubt, a certain overlapping: there were nationalities outside the Empire, and there were Christians—Christian Churches, even; the Eastern Churches are examples—outside the Empire Church. But they were recoverable, it was held; shadowy and ambiguous fragments, as yet unassimilated, and in separation from their proper whole.

11.—The pietistic sentiment which finds expression in what is known as *Papstkultus*, or Devotion to the Pope, is of recent origin. It reached its height under Pius IX., the most representative Pope of modern Catholicism: a clerical journalist adapted the Breviary Hymn:—

" Rerum Deus tenax vigor,
Immotus in te permanens; "

by substituting the name of the Pontiff (Pius) for that of the Deity; and a devout parody of the sequence in the Mass of Pentecost, *Veni, Sancte Spiritus*, followed the same lines. The Catholicism of a more virile age knew nothing of these follies. A Pope is neither a visionary nor a pietist—*excudent alii*: the arts of the popular preacher or director are not his. He is before all things an official, the representative of a great politico-ecclesiastical institution which was before him, and will be after him; of an international polity which has its historical genius, temper, outlook, and laws. This is the key to his policy, which is persistent, and based not on impulse but on calculation—calculation which may, indeed, miscalculate, but which is governed by the invariable motive of self-interest. *Tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento*: here is the tie that binds the Roman Church to the Roman Empire—or to the Power which most nearly represents it: they combine in a common mission, and, for self-preservation, against a common enemy. Domestic quarrels can be adjusted later: meanwhile both stand for Authority, and for the Force—in the last resort a material force—on which Authority rests. The first essential is that the onward movement which carries mankind to unknown destinies, leaving Pope and Emperor alike stranded, shall be arrested, and revolt put down with a strong hand.

It is probable that at first Benedict XV. believed in a speedy and decisive German victory. He was not alone in this belief. The decisive weight of sea-power in modern warfare is imperfectly realised by continental opinion; and since 1870 the German army has been regarded as invincible. As time went on, he doubted. Few even among ourselves foresaw the completeness and suddenness of the end: that an outsider should have failed to do so need excite neither our resentment nor our surprise. And it would be foolish for the Allies to expect the goodwill of the Papacy. In its mediæval shape the Holy Roman Empire disappeared in the Napoleonic wars. But its spirit revived in the Central Powers. Austria was the nearest approach to a Catholic State left in Europe. Only its preponderance on the borderland between Eastern and Western

Christendom stood between Rome and the *terra incognita* of Slav religion: while the third part of the population of the German Empire was Catholic, and the grouping of parties in the Reichstag was such as to give the Catholic Centre a disproportionate influence in German politics; its vote turned the scale. These were assets not to be easily relinquished. This is why an anti-German Papacy was unthinkable. For a moment Pius IX. broke loose; but he came to heel quickly: the pontificate of Leo XIII. was an interlude; the Austrian Veto placed Pius X., who reversed the direction given to affairs by his predecessor, in the Papal chair. Benedict XV., though no friend to Pius X. or to his policy, followed the line of least resistance. The conservative forces in Italian politics, of which the Papacy is the natural centre, were on the German side. Can we wonder that he acted with them? Like goes to like, not to unlike: the Papacy does, we do not, "believe in gods in whose name men kill." Brioux's famous phrase expresses the situation with exactness. The German ideal is akin to the Papal, and can be dovetailed into it with little difficulty. The English, the French, the Italian, the American, cannot: "We are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free." The Papacy may well have felt that, in throwing its weight into the German scale, it was serving the cause of religion. This was, no doubt, its mind when it fought with Philip II. against Elizabeth, with the House of Guise against Henri IV., with Austria and the Italian despots against the Risorgimento. It depends on what is meant by religion; the word may mean more than one thing. The unforgivable offence was the pretence of neutrality. "Le pape en cette guerre, où nous croyons que de notre victoire dépend le salut de l'héritage chrétien, a fait contre nous œuvre d'ennemi." This was to be expected. What is resented, and bitterly resented, is that he did so with a kiss.

12. *Qui apprehendit sapientes in astutia sua*:—"The counsel of the froward" over-reached itself. The dissolution of the Austrian Empire is a mortal blow to Roman Catholicism. Whether the Slav nations whose energies it releases will remain Orthodox is uncertain. But that they will not become Latin is certain: with the disappearance of its political supports the Catholic propaganda among these mixed races disappears. And the dream of the Temporal Power is dissipated. It was hoped that a German success might restore this, if not as it was before 1870, at least in a modified shape. William II. would scarcely have embarked on so perilous an adventure: but it is possible that, to retain his hold on the Centre, he would have made concessions to the Papacy in other directions; and it is certain that he would have dealt hardly with its hereditary enemy, the House of Savoy. These hopes are at an end. The *Avanti Savoia* policy has again triumphed: the Papacy can look forward neither to the gains of rehabilitation nor to the sweets of revenge. Even now, it seems, it is unteachable. A journal whose relations with the Vatican are intimate, the *Corriere d'Italia*, published (December 4th, 1918), under the heading "The Question of the Rhine," an article which the *Temps*

describes as designed—clumsily enough, indeed—"to embroil France and Italy, and as the work of an *agent provocateur*." "Hands off the Rhine," it says in effect; "the Rhine means Imperialism; and Italy would make a bad bargain if she exchanged the Imperialism of Germany for that of France."

"Qui lui a donné cette consigne? On le devine aisément. Ce n'est pas par un simple hasard qu'un article écrit contre la France a paru dans le journal qu'inspire la secrétairerie d'Etat.

"Il y a, dans la chancellerie pontificale, des hommes qui se sont trompés pendant toute cette guerre. Ils ont cru à la victoire d'Allemagne. Ils ont cru à la solidité de l'Autriche. Ils ne nous pardonnent pas leur erreur. Les innombrables échecs que la diplomatie du Vatican a récoltés, jusqu'en Chine, n'ont point assagi les Gasparri, les Tedeschini, les Pacelli, les Ceretti, ni les autres prélats qui en sont responsables. Ils persistent à servir la cause allemande, sous le prétexte de demander l'adoucissement de l'armistice. Ils persistent à souhaiter que l'Italie se rapproche de l'Allemagne ou qu'elle se détourne en tout cas de la France laïque et républicaine. L'article du *Corriere d'Italia*, c'est encore un échantillon de leur hostilité."*

On a large field the impetus given to lay and democratic ideals by the success of the Allies is great. And the segregation of Catholics from the civilisation and culture of the age has been rendered impracticable. Democracy is intolerant of compartments; the citizens possess a common knowledge, and breathe a common air. To what extent will the discredit which attaches to Rome extend to Catholicism? Whether the two coincide may be disputed; but for generations the Church has identified them; and it is difficult not to think that the solvent elements in religion have been strengthened and the cohesive weakened by the disillusionments of the last four years. Nor can we be indifferent to this.

"*Tua res agitur cum proximus ardet.*"

There is a sense in which, with all their mutual rivalries, bickerings, and recriminations, the Churches are one. "Cette guerre," writes a critic, "qui me paraît la fin de l'Europe, me semble devoir être aussi la déchéance du christianisme, religion Européenne. L'orthodoxie russe, le luthéranisme allemand, les prédicants de Genève me semblent singulièrement affaiblis." Yet this sickness, it may be, "is not unto death." The Reformed Churches—perhaps even Russian orthodoxy—have a power of recovery of which Latin Christianity has deprived itself. They "have erred": but for them reform is not, as it is for Rome, suicide. They can revise their past, amend their present, and face the future with hope. So the shades presented themselves to the vision of the Poet:—

"Stabant orantes primi transmittere cursum,
Tendebantque manus, ripæ ulterioris amore."

ALFRED FAWKES.

* Une Querelle d'Allemand.—*Le Temps*, Dec. 8th, 1918.

LEON BOURGEOIS : AN APOSTLE OF PEACE.

NATURE has set upon the face of man certain broad marks for recognition. Sometimes she is extraordinarily explicit and informative. In the features of most of us are planted signs which rarely deceive the observer. There is kindness indicated in the noble lineaments of M. Léon Bourgeois: the broad benevolent nose, the sympathetic mouth framed by the whitening beard and moustache, the eyes that beam with internal radiance. The stranger brought suddenly face to face with this Apostle of Peace could have but one impression, that he was a man of beneficent ideals. And he would be right. I know none whose calm and lofty features more closely correspond with the inward life and aspiration. The very atmosphere you breathe in the house of M. Bourgeois is serene and full of peace. Peace broods upon the lintel of that quiet home near the great church of St. Sulpice. Shut away from the main currents of commotion, it seems to typify the quiet spirit of the Left Bank, the unfashionable side of the Seine, consecrated to the Sorbonne, the Collège de France and the learned schools of Paris, to the Luxembourg and the Senate. When M. Bourgeois takes part in the deliberations of that assemblage of national wisdom he has only a step to go.

Of his wisdom as well as of his benignity there is, happily, no doubt. To-day at the head of the French section of the League of Nations, he has been more or less in the public eye for forty years. His career, if less marked by happenings of a sensational sort, is almost as long as that of M. Clemenceau. Yet no men could provide a greater contrast in character. The Tiger is tempestuous, downright, vigorous in temperament, Celtic in fire and exuberance. M. Bourgeois, on the other hand, is studious and reserved, preferring to conquer by subtle appeals to the intellect and to sweet reason than by high strategy and master strokes of policy and declamatory persuasion. To some he has seemed a little pale in his political personality, precisely because he has turned aside from violence. His mind is of that highly-balanced, sensitive and enlightened sort which has realised that every excess in one direction produces reaction in another. Life for him is a series of adjustments. You can only secure peace by justice, by balancing the claims of one party against those of another, so that an equilibrium is attained. It is precarious, of course, for stable equilibrium would mean monotonous calm, but equilibrium we must always seek. In his philosophy, life is not so much a struggle for existence as a constant tending towards union. That appears to him to be the end of evolution.

But so lofty a view implies education, and education, he seems to say, is the whole duty of politics. In any case, it is the sole method for communicating ideas. Therefore, there is nothing more important than the instruction of the masses. It should be free right to the University, says M. Bourgeois, and not merely in its primary and secondary stages. His ardent desire is to remove inequality where it has been imposed by man. Of course, there cannot be strict equality in this world. Nature has seen to that in

endowing some men with superior gifts and denying them to others. But there should be no human agency at work to increase the natural disability. Remove obstacles that clog the path of progress: that is one of his imperatives.

It is justice—fair treatment for all. Solidarity is really based on that. Without it, it is a vain word. Solidarity implies interdependence and a consciousness of duty more definite and vigorous than charity, and carrying with it social obligations. Very well, we begin to see light in the darkness of our definitions. Solidarity having been built up on justice, on reciprocal regard for each other's interests, can only be nourished and sustained by adopting a large view of our duties towards humanity. Isolation, living to oneself, is not only wrong ethically, but is unscientific. The community system implies common charges, such as taxes for the upkeep of armies and for the administration of justice. Preservation of internal peace is as much the common concern as the maintenance of peace abroad. From which it follows that all these matters of service and obligation hinge on the great question of peace. M. Bourgeois has devoted his life to finding out what is peace, and is pursuing it with unrelaxing energy.

There is a great deal about these things, about the duty of the citizen towards society in contradistinction to the commoner view of society's duties towards himself, in *Solidarité*, which M. Bourgeois published a few years ago. Mutuality, or the science of reciprocal service, is to him the very essence of good citizenship. We are bound to society at every point, and we owe it a hundred duties. In his pages, we hear constantly of our social debt. If education is due to the citizen, insurance against the risks of existence—accident, unemployment, incapacity and old age—form part of the machinery of the progressive State. And beyond that is hygienic solidarity, such as the housing of the poor and the removal of insanitary dwellings. There is scientific warrant for such solidarity. A few years ago the late Professor Metchnikoff, the famous bacteriologist of the Pasteur Institute, pointed out to me that a man merely from personal interest should house well his servants, for their health and comfort reacted directly upon his own and his family's. These things the English with their practical spirit have better understood or better applied than the French. M. Bourgeois, in making this acknowledgment, says that England has adopted some of the principles of social solidarity without knowing it, just as M. Jourdain in Molière's immortal *Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme* spoke prose without being aware of it.

Infant mortality, which threatens the very life of France, especially in the depleted state of her manhood from the war, can only be combated by the widest acceptance of the social spirit. There must be instruction in right methods; there must be improvement in surroundings. If in the living world struggle is the condition of progress, there can be none without association of forces and their harmonious co-ordination. This is the lesson of biology.

It is scarcely to be wondered at that M. Bourgeois should have proceeded from such considerations to the larger aspect of peace amongst the nations. He has always been interested in peace, and

the most brilliant chapters in his life have been given to it, to discussion at the Hague Conference, which he attended as French Ambassador Extraordinary. He made a great impression in this Parliament of the Nations by his grasp of the subjects presented, by the clearness of his intellect, by the breadth of his conceptions. He has written many inspiring words on the subject of those deliberations. He has defined the object of those two sessions in 1899 and 1907 as the juridical organisation of international life. Progressive disarmament, he says, will be the consequence of a state of peace more and more stable, but the only means of reaching it is by the establishment of law, which shall be respected by the States. His remarks on the League of Nations, written nearly a decade ago, might well have been penned last week. There is no man in Europe who can more justly claim parentage of this generous ideal than M. Bourgeois. His speeches contain many allusions to the Society of Nations long before the phrase passed into current politics.

M. Bourgeois points out that economic interests bind nations together in the closest manner. But law has not done it. This "universal community" has only obeyed the laws of competition, of luck and audacity. Is it not possible, he asks, to create out of this community a community of a superior sort bound by legal restraints which should constitute a veritable society? He is convinced that a real peace would result from such a formation.

But as regards the Hague Conventions, M. Bourgeois is as sensible as any of the weakness resulting from the absence of compulsion. It is expressly stipulated that the nations are not bound to arbitrate on matters affecting their vital interests and honour. This is a grievous, almost ironical defect. In a recent conversation with me in Paris M. Bourgeois dwelt on this point at some length. It was curious that Germany with her Allies in the present war resisted the principle of compulsion practically against the rest of the world. It was a sign, even then, of what she intended to do. M. Bourgeois saw that even pecuniary sanctions were not enough; there must be force justly and collectively applied. "War comes from a desire to be strong," he said. "We must have tribunals and police, or we go back to the Middle Ages when men armed because they felt themselves insecure. There was no organised body to take their part. It is so with the nations to-day. The little nations feel they must defend themselves against the strong, and the strong arm to become still stronger so that they may dominate the others. It is all based on fear, on the uncertainties of existence, on the absence of a properly constituted authority dispensing justice and law in international matters. This was responsible for the competition in armaments which was gradually carrying us to the abyss."

M. Bourgeois worked out the idea to show that the private citizen ceased to carry arms when courts and the police force offered him sufficient protection for himself and his property. In the same way nations would limit their armaments to the barest necessities if a central organised force existed to defend the right.

The sanctions provided by the Hague were not sufficiently efficacious, admitted M. Bourgeois. In the last resort there must be military power against a violation of the international pact by any state. In this way we should avoid a return to the abominable catastrophe which had overwhelmed us.

M. Bourgeois was the Reporter to the Committee charged with examining into the question of the League, and he has produced a remarkable document only partially presented in the published scheme. Starting out with the natural instinct of self-preservation, the nations are now only to be restrained from ruining themselves by setting up a proper judicial machinery and a gendarmerie to enforce its provisions. Thus would the big armies be restrained from crushing the little, and even measures of economic pressure could not be taken as against the small nations without the consent of the League. "Each nation has its vital interests," said M. Bourgeois, "but none is more vital than the preservation of peace. We owe it to our million dead in the war," he added solemnly, "not to recommence hostilities. Every nation must make the sacrifices necessary to maintain peace."

We spoke a little of the elections in England, and M. Bourgeois expressed admiration for the talents and character of Mr. Lloyd George. "I was much struck by his oratorical power in hearing him speak a couple of years ago," said M. Bourgeois, who has been Minister of Labour in three War Cabinets, under MM. Briand, Ribot, and Painlevé. He regretted, he said, the disappearance from public life of Mr. Asquith and also, largely, of Lord Grey. For both statesmen he has a great respect. "The elections show that the immense majority in England wish for the organisation of law in the world," commented the French statesman. "The elections, too, mark the dislocation of the old parties in the State. They respond no longer to the new needs. We must create a new organisation founded on justice and solidarity. Social peace must be established on the same lines as international peace. Arbitration must be adopted to avoid strikes. When I was Minister of Labour, I tried to get the masters to see the men's point of view and *vice versa*. To the employers I said: 'Put on the workman's blouse and think of his anxieties for the morrow. Perhaps there is no coal or food in the house for wife and children.' I asked the men to wear, imaginatively, 'the black coat and top hat of their employer, and to think of his responsibility.'"

It is anxiety for the future which sharpens disputes. Remove that by an all-round system of insurance and you do much to promote an atmosphere of conciliation. Masters should combine to ensure against loss of profit and workmen against the special dangers and disadvantages of their calling. If both sides were fully organised and able to rely on the help of their fellows they would come to the conference table in a spirit conducive to an equitable agreement. Insurance would enable the employer to guarantee participation in the profits to his staff.

M. Bourgeois feels that most of the pressing problems of to-day are amenable to the principles of justice and fair play and to the

exercise of forethought. Once these questions are out of the way, humanity can give itself to the contemplation of loftier subjects—to the evolution of what is good in the human soul and to works of pure beneficence.

The career of M. Bourgeois has been singularly rich in political experience. He has occupied every post in the ministerial gamut, has been *Président du Conseil*, and twice Minister for Foreign Affairs. He could have been President of the Republic, and was offered the post on two occasions by the unanimous vote of the Republican groups, but he felt that the state of his health and of his eyesight precluded his acceptance. The fact that he is popular with all parties has been of considerable assistance to him in the furtherance of his humanitarian ideas. That popularity is proof of his moderation, of his sentiment of *equipoise* which is always present with him. Nor was it disadvantageous to his general acceptance by the community that he was engaged in brilliant debates at the Hague at the moment when the Dreyfus case reached its most acrimonious point. Of that Conference at the Hague he says that it was by no means a failure, for did it not stop England from going to war with Russia over the Dogger Bank incident, France from warring with Germany over Casablanca, and America and Japan from fighting over a shipping episode?

CHARLES DAWBARN.

LEAGUE OR FEDERATION.

THE statesmen of the world have now before them one of those opportunities which occur but once or twice in an epoch; and it is impossible to believe that they will allow it to pass without some attempt to solve the great problem which it presents, and upon the right solution of which depends the prospect of a new and better era. But much turns upon the plan adopted; and these lines are written in the hope that, for once in the world's history, courage of the highest kind, moral and intellectual, may take the place of that unhappy pessimism which, disguised under the name of "practical wisdom," has too often wrecked the finest hopes of humanity.

We may venture, surely, to discredit the cynical prophecies of the few survivors of the pre-war age, who declare that all hopes of a World Union will disappear in the hungry struggle over details which will take place at the peace settlement, and that the Congress of Versailles will be but a slightly improved edition of the Congress of Vienna. The work which President Wilson has already done is a guarantee that the principles of the statesman and the historian will not be entirely swamped by the details dear to the diplomatist. But the somewhat disquieting fact that the great majority of the members of the Conference are officials, with that fatal distrust of ideas and lack of imagination which beset the official mind, should put the true statesman on his guard. If only the official could for once realise that he is a trustee for millions of human beings who are far more in touch than he with realities, much might be hoped. And, surely, recent events should have convinced him, if he is not past conviction, that imagination, in a case like the present, is, to put it at the lowest, at least as important as a care of details. We have not only to think in continents, but in centuries.

It is not difficult to foresee that, unless the whole problem of the peace of the world is to be left once more to the sport of chance, the great question which looms before the architects of a World Union is that which is briefly expressed in the title of this article: and it must be admitted, that the utterances of the official world have aroused a suspicion that its weight will incline towards the easier, half-hearted solution. The great and beneficent influence of President Wilson will probably compel a serious discussion of a scheme to provide for the future settlement of such questions as those which have so often wrecked the world's peace, and which are bound, from time to time, in a changing universe, to give cause for anxiety. It is, therefore, the duty of those who have the welfare of humanity at heart to make their protest, ere it is too late, against that fatal timidity which seeks the easier course, at the sacrifice of the harder but only effective solution of the problem. Wherefore it is submitted, that there are at least four good reasons why the aim of the delegates to the Peace Congress should be, not a mere League of Governments to avert war, but a Federation of Nations

to create an effective peace which shall render war an anachronism.

1. In all great affairs, especially in affairs which depend largely for their success upon popular faith, it is wise to avoid unhappy associations. It hardly needs the learning of the professed psychologist to impress upon us the enormous influence on the average man, from his cradle to his grave, of the association of ideas. If the most wholesome food can be served in such a manner that a starving man would reject it, if the gestures of the gravest statesman recall the influences of his earliest years, we cannot ignore the overwhelming importance of association. On this ground alone, the hopes of a League of Governments would start under the least favourable auspices. The Holy Alliance and the Concert of Europe stand out as warning beacons against the world's horizon, as the eloquent omens of shattered dreams. We can hardly hope to live down their malign influence.

On the other hand, Federation has been the most conspicuously successful of all modern political experiments. The plan which has made Switzerland perhaps the best-governed of all countries, which freed the Netherlands, after an epic struggle against overwhelming forces, from the Spanish yoke, which has made of the scattered and disunited American colonies the greatest nation in the world, which is slowly welding Canada, Australia, and South Africa into great and free communities, which has, even in its present elementary form, given a new lease of life to the British Empire, has nothing to fear from the test of experience. In appealing for Federation against a Military League, at least we appeal from failure to success.

2. For a mere League of Governments, let us make no mistake, means, at best, a League whose one object is to prevent war. That this is, in itself, an entirely desirable object, goes without saying—it is, indeed, the common ground of all advocates of union. But the question is: Would it have that result? A Military League must, by its nature, be largely worked by men whose thoughts and aptitudes are absorbed in matters of war. Its officials must always be thinking, speaking, writing, in terms of war—doubtless with the avowed intention of preventing war, but, again, in an atmosphere in which everything is measured by war standards. Once more the association of ideas is at work. Surely we have read our lesson, the lesson of the "mailed fist" and "shining armour." It is not the least plausible explanation of the utter immorality of the masses of the German people, in the crucial years before 1914, that they, by nature an impressionable and too docile people, were talked into war by a small group of influential men whose every public utterance was couched in terms of war. The motives of these men may have been deliberately malicious. They probably were. But, even if they had been benevolent, the result would have been the same. They created the war-charged atmosphere; and the explosion followed. Shall we be blind to this fact?

3. On the other hand, in a Federation of Nations war falls into its proper place, as a dread contingency, never to be overlooked or

forgotten, but treated as a remote possibility, of which the less said the better. The wise physician does not debauch the minds of his patients with discussion of the symptoms of mania or the statistics of cancer; these grave facts have their appropriate sphere in the laboratory or the councils of experts. He speaks rather to his lay audience of wholesome activities and sane habits, of hopes of improvement and cheerful possibilities, avoiding by every means the growth of a morbid atmosphere.

So also with the statesmen and officials of a Federal Government. Whilst never failing to realise the possibility of quarrels, their activities are mainly and avowedly concerned with the production of harmony. They are there to foster amongst their constituent States the elements of united effort. Their powers may be limited to any extent by the terms of their mandate. But at least there are some avenues of positive achievement open to them. They can stimulate the exchange of products, develop latent resources, improve means of communication, promote enterprises too great for their individual States, encourage the study of questions, such as sanitation and scientific research, in which all are alike interested, apply that great principle of mutual insurance which is one of the most hopeful instruments of progress.

But here, of course, the advocate of Federation is met by the triumphant objector, waving his banner whereon is emblazoned the fatal word "Sovereignty," with its more modern and plausible pendants of "self-determination," "national independence," and other vague but attractive catchwords. Are we indeed children, that we can any longer be scared by such bogies? The doctrine of Sovereignty was, originally, a *pis aller*, invented by Bodin and Grotius to soothe the apprehensions of those Protestant States which refused to recognise the authority of a Papal Empire. It has since been perverted by Hobbes and his juristic disciples, especially by John Austin, into a legal scarecrow. It has been condemned alike by modern statesmen as anarchic, and by modern lawyers as unnecessary. National feeling is a sacred thing; for it symbolises the desire of men and women to work for common ideals in a voluntary union. But, soberly examined, it amounts, in all its reasonable manifestations, simply to a desire to live under a common government based on consent; and what is there in that inconsistent with Federation? Is it not rather another aspect of the same principle? The essence of federation is government by consent; just as the essence of patriotism, divested of vague and exploded theories of "race" and "blood," is devotion to a common ideal. Is the citizen of Maine or Massachusetts the less loyal to his State because he owes allegiance also to the American Republic, the citizen of Berne or Geneva to his Canton because he is a subject of the Confederation, the Englishman to England, the Welshman to Wales, or the Canadian to Canada, because each is also a citizen of the British Empire? Each would regard an affirmative answer as an insult.

4. Finally, there is one practical reason of the greatest weight in favour of the closer union. A League of Governments has no

head, and no direct executive power; a Federation has both, and it is hardly possible to say which is the more essential for really effective action in the interests of permanent peace. Without a head, a person predestined to speak the decisive word in a sudden crisis, no really effective organisation is possible, even in commercial affairs; how much less in the more complicated affairs of world politics. It is hardly too much to claim, that the existence of such a person would have averted war in the crucial weeks of 1914. It is, in fact, the great tragedy of that supreme crisis, that, as the published correspondence shows, while the will to peace was abundant and earnest among the great majority of statesmen, there was no one with recognised authority to utter the decisive word—to say boldly: “The responsibility rests with me. I appeal to those who have entrusted me with it. There shall be no war.” It is difficult to believe that, had such an authority existed, the trembling balance would not have inclined on the right side.

But of course it is obvious that such an authority must rest on a sure foundation; and here again appears the superiority of the higher aim. A League of Governments relies upon a composite force, hastily levied, ill-assorted, sundered by national jealousies and rivalries, difficult to assemble, unwilling to submit to a common leader. A true Federation has its own resources, drawn, doubtless, from the citizens of its constituent States, but welded by common training and centralised administration into a united force, capable of swift and irresistible action, full of *esprit de corps*, accustomed to obey known leaders. With such a force in existence to guarantee their safety, it is possible for the constituent States to disarm; without it, disarmament is a dream. There is the field for the true military expert, whose whole soul is filled with the importance of his task. It is useless to attempt to stifle military, or any other kind of genius. The ideal is to enrol in the interests of the world's peace—to take it, in fact, at its own constantly avowed valuation. Unhappily, there is little fear that, for generations at least, it will be an idle force. There will be plenty for it to do, in the suppression of nascent feuds, the overawing of barbaric violence, the policing of primitive anarchy; but its work will be really effective, not a mere pulling down to build up again. And, if its duties will be arduous and exacting, its part will be glorious. It will be the guarantee of the world's peace.

Why should this be a vision? It stands to reason that the head of a World Federation in these days would be an elected chief. He might be elected for a very short period, like the President of the Swiss Federation. To avoid the danger of permanent hegemony, it might be provided that a citizen of the same State should not be re-elected till after a considerable interval. His powers would be rigidly confined within the terms of the Federal Pact. The national life of the various States would go on almost unchanged, save for the relief from the nightmare and oppression of increasing armaments. Each nation would be free to form its own ideals and realise them as seemed to it best, save only that nation, if such survived, whose ideal was to wreck the world's peace. And it is

precisely such a nation which cannot be allowed to exist, if the hideous sacrifices of the recent war are not to be repeated on a greater scale, if the millions of wrecked human lives, the outpouring of blood and treasure, the immense and exhausting labour of war efforts, are not to have been all in vain. When our best, the very flower of the world's manhood, have gone gallantly to a hideous death for our sakes, have turned their backs on the opening vista of life that we might live, shall we fail in a task which, after all, demands little more than a laying aside of petty jealousies and empty phrases? How paltry, compared with theirs, the sacrifice we are called upon to make. They have not flinched from the stern test of physical danger. Shall we fail before the milder ordeal of moral courage? Shall we not rather give to our shattered heroes the best of all rewards—the assurance that their children, and their children's children, shall be free from the scourge of war? Shall we not build to our sacred dead the sublimest of all possible memorials, a world in which such a war as that which has left humanity bleeding and well-nigh bankrupt shall be but a legend of the evil past?

EDWARD JENKS.

THE TRENTINO OF GREECE.

LORD BRYCE, in the December issue of THE CONTEMPORARY REVIEW, drew attention to the problems awaiting solution in relation to Western Asia, "and particularly the territories belonging to that Turkish Empire which has now ceased to exist." The eminent British statesman dealt with the terrible case of Armenia. I would here sketch the case of the Greeks of Asia Minor, whose future must surely be determined by the principle which Lord Bryce rightly places in the forefront of his contribution: "Recognition of the right to self-determination of each nationality or people."

I.

The modern history of Asia Minor opens with the defeat of the Emperor Romanus Diogenes by the Seljuks of Alp Arslan at the battle of Manzikert in 1071. With this defeat begins the decline of that Byzantine civilisation, based on Greek culture, Orthodox Christianity, and the Roman Imperial tradition, which in the Middle Ages had made Anatolia a rich and densely populated country. The Christian "Roman" populations of the interior were absorbed by the Seljuks and Islamised. The two great Tartar invasions of 1243 and 1402 devastated the land, and Yuruk and Turcoman tribes, roaming in their wake, "nomadised" the great plateau of Asia Minor. Out of this welter of races and creeds the energy of the Ottoman dynasty and the institution of Janissaries—one of the great institutions of human history—evolved an Empire.

II.

But if the Seljuks succeeded in destroying Romaic civilisation in Anatolia, the Ottoman Turks, their successors, did not destroy Greek nationality in the Æolic and Ionian coastlands, where it had become firmly rooted in the course of 2,000 years. They ground the faces of the Greek population, but they made no attempt to displace or Islamise them *en bloc*. The Turkish element never became more than an immense army of occupation in a land which remained Greek. The very place-names in Turkish (Sakaria, Ismid, Panderma, Bergama, Izmir, Menderé, Ayasoluk, &c.)* testify that the Turks have been a distorting but not an assimilating influence. Occasionally the Young Turk idea of "complete Turkification" entered the mind of a Sultan, a Selim I., or an Ibrahim, only to be immediately dismissed as impracticable. For not only was it difficult to carry out in itself, but it conflicted with the axioms of Ottoman policy as laid down by Mahommed the Conqueror. The Christian "Rayah" was an indispensable support of the edifice of Ottoman power. He supplied the money for the upkeep of the State, the true believer paying no taxes. He supplied the *personnel* of secretaries and dragomans who did all the dirty work of adminis-

* Corruptions respectively of the Greek Sangarius, Nicomedia, Panormus, Pergamos, Smyrna, Mæander, Haghios Theologos.

tration and diplomacy. Above all, he furnished tribute-children to fight for the greater glory of the Sultan. He was as useful, in a word, as the domestic animals whose names the Turk often applied to him.

Further, it was absurd that Turkish officials should trouble themselves with his affairs, or that infidels should be justiciable before courts in which the Sheri or Koranic Law was administered. Accordingly Mahommed gave the "Roman nation" a charter of self-government and his successors were glad to confirm it. The Greeks were organised in self-governing communes subject to the control of the Bishop of the diocese, himself subject to the control of the Patriarch of Constantinople who crowned the edifice, "the captive king of a captive people." They had their own courts, presided over by their bishops and administering Roman law. They had their own schools, for which the Bishops were responsible and which the Turks regarded as so many annexes to their churches. Thus the "Roum-Millet" became a perfect *imperium in imperio*, theocratically organised, and the Rayah, if his life, honour, and property were never safe, was at any rate protected, even by the interests of his oppressors, against denationalisation.

For three centuries the Greek nation has no history beyond the tale of long-drawn suffering silently endured. With the eighteenth century signs of improvement become noticeable. The levy of tribute children had been abolished. The Greek lands were at least no longer the scene of constant warfare, and trade began to revive. Above all, an intellectual and moral regeneration was accompanied and fostered by the opening of schools all over the Greek lands. Asia Minor played a prominent part in the movement. There was the great Evangelical School in Smyrna, founded in 1733 and still extant, possessing the only library worth the name to be found in Asia Minor, and called by Elysée Reclus "a veritable home of civilisation and intellectual propaganda on the threshold of Asia." There were the flourishing schools and Academy of the semi-independent seaport of Aivali (Kydonies), the "Oriental Boston," whose inhabitants towards the beginning of the nineteenth century were seized with such an enthusiasm for Hellenic antiquity that they decided in their Municipal Assembly henceforth to speak nothing but Attic Greek, every relapse into the vernacular to be punished with an imposition of Homeric lines. In Trebizond a Greek college had been opened as early as 1650, and all over the country elementary schools sprang up to which the Greek children went by moonlight, when there were no Turks about. Adamantios Koraes, "the literary father of the Greek Revolution," was born in Smyrna, and addressed his letters on the French Revolution and its implications to the choirmaster of the Church of Haghia Photine in that city.

The revolt of European Greece in 1821 turned the fury of the Turks against the Greeks of Asia Minor. Aivali was burned to the ground, and massacres took place in Smyrna and Pergamos. This did not arrest the Greek revival. The Earl of Carlisle, visiting

Western Asia Minor in 1853, was reminded by the state of the Turks of "the prediction in the Apocalypse of the waters of the Euphrates being dried up." "The Greek village," he noted, "increases in population, and teems with children; in the Turkish village you find roofless walls and crumbling mosques" ("A Diary in Turkish and Greek Waters," p. 77). In the course of the last four years history has repeated itself. German organisation has enabled the Young Turks to make a last despairing effort to thwart the complete emancipation of the Greek race by perpetrating on a gigantic scale horrors to which a parallel is only to be found in their own exploits in Armenia.

Massacre, however, cannot permanently arrest that "steady, inexorable, irresistible spread of Greek influence in the Western parts of Asia Minor," which, according to Sir W. M. Ramsay, is "by far the most striking fact in modern Turkey." The Turkish colonists are dying out. "The Oriental element does not retreat or emigrate, it is not driven out by force, it dies out in these parts by a slow but sure decay. You can only say that here the people was and here it has almost ceased to be." The Greeks have not only the past on their side, but the future as well. Dr. Karl Dieterich, an observant German not unfriendly to the Turks, calculates that the Greek population in the vilayets of Brusa and Aidin has increased from 650,000 to a million in 25 years. Not only is the Greek birth-rate much higher, but from the densely populated islands off the coast Greek immigrants are steadily coming in. Trade and schools are the two instruments of this re-assertion of Hellenism in Asia Minor.

The Turk has a positive aversion for trade. "It is strange," observes Sir Charles Eliot, "how, when trade becomes active in any seaport or along a railway line, the Osmanli retires and disappears, while Greeks, Armenians, and Levantines thrive in his place." Sir W. M. Ramsay has described ("Impressions of Turkey," pp. 42-43) how in many of those Turkish villages of the interior of Asia Minor which he knows so well there is no trade whatsoever, no exchange of commodities, and no coined money. In others you will only find a "Bakal" who keeps a shop, where he sells anything from blankets to tobacco. He is invariably a Greek, and usually the best-off man in the village, with the Turkish peasants all in his debt. The hum of market-places and the roar of the locomotive are positively offensive to the Turk's ear. When he can stand it no longer he makes off for the interior, where there are plenty of shady trees, under which he can recline and smoke, while he listens to the pleasant sound of running water.

A few examples will suffice to illustrate this process of Greek expansion through trade. At the beginning of the eighteenth century Smyrna was a quiet town of 30,000 inhabitants, mostly Turks. It is now the busiest port of the Empire, with a population of 416,000, of whom 243,000 are Greeks. A century ago the Turks represented 70 per cent. of the population—to-day they are barely 25 per cent. Similarly Samsun in 1875 was a big village of 3,000 inhabitants. But it is the only good harbour on the south coast of

the Black Sea and the outlet for the tobacco grown in the Kizil-irmak basin. To-day it has nearly 40,000 inhabitants. Numerically the Greeks are a majority in it, economically they are everything. An instance related by Sir W. M. Ramsay is characteristic of the process going on further inland. "When we visited the Lycos valley in October, 1881," he writes, "the railway had not gone up so far. In Serai-Keui we were entertained by a Greek, who told us that he was the only Christian in the village, and that he had come there as agent for one of the two railways which competed for the trade of the valley. In 1882, or early in 1883, the railway line was opened as far as Serai-Keui, and Serai-Keui has steadily grown Greek. Turkish statistics for 1894 give its Greek population as 450, but this was probably too low an estimate. Growth in Turkey is, of course, always slow. The Ottoman railway has now (*i.e.*, 1897) gone up beyond Serai-Keui some 70 miles, . . . and the same process is going on all along the line." These phenomena of rapid growth stand out against the background of a Turkish population steadily diminishing. Dr. Dieterich himself admits that the Greeks have "the controlling hand in trade and traffic as well as in the cultivation of the soil" west of the line Ismid-Eski-shehir-Afium-kara-hissar-Isbarta-Adalia. Further, it is a mistake to think that the Greek element is confined within the towns. There are compact Greek rural populations—*e.g.*, in the peninsula of Tchesme, and in the Menderé and Sakaria valleys, which live by fishing, fruit-raising, or silk culture; and there are districts, such as the caza of Ghevizeh, in which the town is mainly Turkish, with the Greeks predominant in the country. More provident and hard-working than the Turk, the Greek peasant is steadily getting the land back into his hands. Dr. Dieterich, though he dislikes the urban Greeks, admits that these Greek peasants are "energetic and intelligent, irreconcilable in their hatreds and by no means lacking in courage. It is to these praiseworthy qualities and not to their much-bruited craftiness that they owe their progress in the interior of Asia Minor." But the most striking tribute to the vitality of Greek trade in Asia Minor is to be found in the pamphlets issued during the past five years by the Young Turk "Committee for Economic War." "As we pass through the bazaars and markets of our cities," says one of these, "what do we see? In the narrowest alleys and the broadest boulevards alike the greater part of our shops are in the hands of the Greeks. They possess everything, from the groceries to the largest and finest shops. By their cleverness and their attractive conversation they succeed in drawing all Musulman clients." The conclusion is this: "O brother in Islam, let us swear an oath under the glittering lights of our fair mosques. Let us say, 'O God, by Thy Holy Name I swear never to give five paras (just under a farthing) to any grocer who is not a member of the corporation of Musulman grocers.'" This "question d'épicerie" should not be taken too lightly. The root idea of German policy in Turkey is to extirpate these Greek "bakals" and replace them with Germans. It is with this object in view that the German Staff of the Turkish Army

organised during the war the deportation of half a million Greeks from their homes.

The other great instrument of Greek expansion is the schools. These unpretending Greek schools have done as much in their way for the regeneration of Greece as the German universities did for the unification of Germany. The modern Greek has inherited from his more illustrious ancestors a genuine respect for education. In Asia Minor mothers repeat to their children the saw: "An illiterate man is a piece of rough timber." The aspiration of every young Greek who migrates to Alexandria or America is to get rich quickly and build a school in his native village, his name to be inscribed on the pediment as that of an "Evergetes" or national benefactor. In 1912 there were 2,051 Greek schools in Asia Minor attended by 165,281 children, the total Greek population amounting to 1,692,376. The Turkish Government has never contributed a piastre towards the expenses of these schools, which are met by the Greek Communes assisted by private munificence. Yet it is almost impossible to find an instance in Asia Minor of a Greek school closed down because sufficient money for its upkeep was not forthcoming. The significance of the figures just quoted becomes apparent if we follow Dr. Dieterich in his comparison of them with the statistics of the State-endowed Turkish schools. He calculates that, on an average, 60 pupils attend every Greek school, as against twenty attending every Turkish school. In towns predominantly Turkish, such as Nazli or Alashehir, the number of children attending Greek schools is double the number of those attending Turkish schools (Nazli, 220,162; Alashehir, 525,250). Even in Brusa, where the Greeks are only 10 per cent. of the population, their schools are attended by 2,500 pupils as against 5,000 attending the Turkish schools. Thanks to these schools, the Greeks as they return into the interior of Asia Minor take with them their language and political ideals. Better educated than the Turks, they not only monopolise the learned professions, but are better equipped for the economic struggle. Dr. Dieterich very properly concludes his study* by recommending energetic educational measures to the Turks if they would meet the Greek offensive in Asia Minor.

III.

I shall now attempt to trace a line of ethnological demarcation in Western Asia Minor, to the seaward side of which the Greek element is in all cases predominant or well on the way to becoming so again.

Such a line would first ascend the Sakaria river, that Sangarius along which Manuel Comnenus planted a line of fortresses to keep back the Seljuk from Constantinople. For nearly two centuries the warlike Bithynian hillmen held their ground manfully, till the folly of Michael Palaeologus caused them to be disarmed, and enabled the Ottoman bands to break through. To the west of this

* *Das Griechentum Kleinasiens*, Leipzig, 1915.

river, the Sandjak of Skutari contains 124,281 Turks, 74,457 Greeks, and 35,560 Armenians, and the Independent Government of Ismid 116,949 Turks, 73,134 Greeks, and 48,635 Armenians.* In these districts the Greek population is increasing with especial rapidity. Less than a century ago Kadikeui (Chalcedon) was a purely Turkish town—to-day its 30,000 inhabitants are almost equally divided into Turks, Greeks, and Armenians. The Greek peasantry have almost monopolised silk culture in the Sakaria valley proper, while the opening-up of the Haidar-Pasha-Ismid railway is rapidly re-Hellenising such old Greek centres as Daridsha, the Byzantine Aretsu.

The next landmark is the "massif" of Bithynian Olympus. Around Brusa, the old capital of the Osmanli dynasty, is a strong Turkish enclave, the caza of Brusa containing 72,993 Turks, as against 21,850 Greeks. Orkhan, the son of Osman, broke up the numerous monasteries which had given Olympus the name of Keshish-Dagh, or Monks' Mountain, and colonised the mountain-slopes with Turks. The coast line, however, is still ethnologically Greek (caza of Kios 13,000 Greeks, 12,354 Turks—caza of Mudania 26,710 Greeks, 8,404 Turks). There is another Turkish enclave further west in the Biga and Bairamitch districts, but the coast of the Troad is Greek, from the peninsula of Artaki (54,700 Greeks, 5,418 Turks) to the seaport of Aivali (46,130 Greeks, 89 Turks). In the interior the Greeks are a steadily growing minority along the Panderma-Balikesri-Magnesia railway, becoming a majority in the direction of Pergamos and Magnesia.

The sandjak of Smyrna, to which we now come, is the stronghold of the Greek race in Asia Minor. Smyrna itself, which Kinglake called "the chief town and capital of the Grecian race," contains a larger Greek population than any city except Constantinople. In the sandjak, as a whole, there are 449,044 Greeks as against 219,494 Turks on a total population of 754,046. The Turks are only in the majority in the three cazas of Odemich, Thira, and Baidir towards the interior. In the remaining ten, in spite of the fact that the Smyrna district was specially picked out by the Turkish authorities as a dumping ground for "Moadjir" colonies, the Greek element is strongly predominant. South of Smyrna the Greeks are numerous in the Aidin district (caza of Aidin 19,982 Greeks, 46,578 Turks), and a majority along the coast in the caza of Sokia (25,801 Greeks, 12,987 Turks). There are also Greek enclaves further inland at Kula, Alashehir and Nazli, while the "valley of the upper Menderés has become," in Mr. D. G. Hogarth's words, "a focus of Greek life in the past half generation." Below Aidin the mountainous caza of Tchina brings the Turkish line close to the sea, and the Sandjak of Mentese, which has a large Turkish majority, is only Greek at certain points on the littoral, notably Budrum, the ancient Halicarnassus, and Makri.

This, then, is Grecia Irredenta in Asia Minor. If the Skutari and Ismid districts are to be assigned to an internationalised "Byzantine Republic," a line drawn from Panderma on the Sea of

* The statistics quoted above are all taken from a census of 1912.

Marmora through Balikesri, Alashehir and Nazli to Budrum represents the irreducible minimum of what Greece claims. She claims these lands because they have formed a part of the Greek world for more than twenty centuries, and because to-day the Greek element is a majority in them, and the pivot of their economic and intellectual life.

The problem thus outlined cannot be ignored by the British public. Sir Thomas Holdich has recently emphasised in striking language the importance of Greek friendship for British interests: "The importance of the position which Greece holds as a maritime state in overlooking the Eastern Mediterranean can hardly be exaggerated. . . . Greece has certainly to be reckoned with in the Balkan settlement, and the more closely her interests can be proved identical with those of Britain, the better." The vitality of the Asiatic Greeks admits of no doubt. Sir W. M. Ramsay wrote in 1897, the year of the disastrous Turco-Greek War: "The Asiatic Greeks have the future in their hands; and no man or no policy will be successful which does not recognise that fact, and build upon it as foundation."

The facts of geography, sometimes distorted into an argument against the Greeks, might, with far more justification, serve as a basis of their case. Nature has sharply differentiated the steppes of the interior, walled in by high mountains, from the valleys and plains of the coast. The interior is an extension of Central Asia, the western coast lands are "almost a part of Europe," forming with European Greece a single geographical unit which a distinguished geographer has called the "Aegeid." To the geographical division corresponds a permanent ethnological antithesis. The clash of Greek and "Barbarian" in Asia Minor dates back to the war of Smyrna and Sardis, sung by Mimnermus. The Turkish Conquest in the 14th century was a devastating flood which swept down from the overhanging plateau and submerged the coast-lands. The tide has now decidedly turned. When the Turk is thrust back into his homelands, the bleak mountains that loom behind these sunlit coasts, the smile of prosperity will soon return to the regions which were once "the eye of Asia."

M. G. CHRUSSACHI.

THE ADMINISTRATION OF MILITARY LAW.

MILITARY Law is "the law which governs the soldier in peace and in war, at home and abroad." It is mainly embodied in the Army Act (so-called since 1881, but in earlier times after 1689 called the Mutiny Act), which is yearly brought in force by the Army (Annual) Act. Without this annual re-enactment the maintenance of a standing army in time of peace would be unconstitutional, and the Army's code would be even less amenable to amendment than it is. The Army Act and the Rules of Procedure, framed under its authority, are set out at length in the *Manual of Military Law*, published by the War Office (first edition, 1884), and familiar in every orderly room. It is not quite exhaustive, for Section 8 of King's Regulations is consulted as to offences against discipline, which come within the province of a Commanding Officer and a Company commander.

Part I. of the Army Act classifies all breaches of Military Law. In practice most fall within the following categories: offences in the field; mutiny and insubordination; desertion and absence without leave; drunkenness; offences against custody; corrupt dealings; offences against property; civil crimes (over which civil courts have concurrent jurisdiction). Whatever wrong may not appear to fall within any among these and other specific groups can still be swept up under such general sections as S. 16, which deals with scandalous behaviour "unbecoming the character of an officer and gentleman," and S. 40, which covers "any act, conduct, disorder, or neglect, to the prejudice of good order and military discipline."

Section 44 of the Army Act sets out a wide range of punishment. For officers and men, there is a liability to sentences of death, penal servitude for a period not less than three years, and imprisonment up to two. Officers can be cashiered or dismissed the service. They can forfeit seniority of rank, and be reprimanded or severely reprimanded. Men can be sentenced to detention up to two years, be discharged with ignominy, be fined, or have (in certain cases such as loss of kit through neglect) stoppages made in their pay.

For military offences committed overseas in war time, the tribunal is a Field General Court-martial of three members. At home a General Court-martial of nine members, usually with a General as President, deals with cases against officers, and can alone sentence to death or to penal servitude. Other cases at home are normally tried by a District Court-martial with three members, of whom the President is a field officer. This Court's jurisdiction is limited to the award of two years' detention or imprisonment.

It is obvious that great importance attaches to-day to the law and practice of these tribunals, but no branch of law is less touched by public opinion or less known to the ordinary citizen. For this remoteness from scrutiny there are several causes. First, although sittings are theoretically open to the public and the Press, no civilian is present as a spectator at 999 out of every 1,000 cases at home, or in any case whatever on active service abroad. Secondly, the

conditions of military service disable any serving soldier from publishing criticism or comment on Courts-martial. He alone really knows their inner working, and he is muzzled under the ban of King's Regulations. Thirdly, the only civilian influence on the course of Military Law is that of the Judge Advocate General and his department. Their work is one of revision only. They never come in personal touch with a Court-martial. They know neither its atmosphere nor its *personnel*. Fourthly, Parliamentary discussions on this aspect of Army administration have been usually in the hands of men quite unversed in its true routine. During the war much has been said as to possible appeals from death sentences, as to that barbarous survival "field punishment No. 1," and as to the treatment of alleged "conscientious" objectors, but little on other points. The questions that have been thus touched upon are merely on the fringe of our Army code.

It would be well for the country if Courts-martial were not so far removed from the influence of public opinion. Military Law is inevitably slow to change, for it is wholly the work of lawyers and soldiers. Neither the Press nor the politicians have had a hand in its growth. The man in the street knows nothing about it, and thinks darkly of its mysteries. Bernard Shaw has attacked it absurdly as being "lynch law, administered by a trade union of officers." Indifference and ignorance on the part of the public are alike unhealthy.

In actual fact, Military Law is a good working code, and its virtues are a great tribute to the fairness and skill of the men who have made it. So far as the letter of the law is concerned, its provisions are at least as favourable to liberty as those of the Common Law, and its procedure is so carefully defined in the Manual that there are probably fewer pitfalls in its practice. Field General Courts-martial overseas have, indeed, an admirably abridged procedure of their own. Among the many safeguards that have been devised against possible injustice, the following may be mentioned. It is the prosecutor's duty to bring out the truth and anything in favour of the accused; he is not to press for a conviction. The accused is entitled to object to be tried by any individual President or other member of the Court where he feels prejudiced. The utmost latitude must be allowed to the accused both in statement and cross-examination. He is always entitled to the help of a "friend" or counsel. Reasonable facilities are given him to procure the attendance of witnesses. When the Court considers its finding or its sentence, the junior member expresses his view first so as to preclude the possibility of his being overawed by his seniors. On Field General Courts-martial a death sentence must be unanimous. The confirming authority can only reduce a sentence; he cannot increase it. The Manual lays down that the fullest weight must be attached to all mitigating circumstances. If a soldier elects under S. 46 (8) of the Army Act to be tried by Court-martial, instead of accepting his C.O.s punishment, he can reconsider his choice a day later, and in no case is his charge to be magnified after election, or his penalty to be enhanced.

No one who has often taken part in Courts-martial cases will

question the fairness, courtesy, and patience which characterise trials. An accused is given the benefit of any doubt. If the proportion of acquittals is comparatively low, it is due to the care which is usually taken not to convene Courts-martial in the absence of a real *prima-facie* case against an accused.

The war has modified Military Law in very few material points. Its main amendments have been in its administration only.

First, by the Army (Suspension of Sentences) Act, 1915, a soldier can be retained in the field, instead of necessarily undergoing penal servitude or imprisonment. By an amending Act of 1916 his conduct is reported on at intervals not exceeding every three months, and ultimately the sentence can be got rid of altogether if he has shown consistent devotion to duty. This statute saves the firing-line from a leakage of man-power, and rightly enables a man to redeem himself from what is, as often as not, a military crime committed involuntarily or without bad intent.

Secondly, the rough standard of punishments suggested in King's Regulations for various offences has had to be adapted to the needs of the day. Imprisonment, by which the soldier is relegated to a civil prison, has been practically dropped in the United Kingdom, in favour of the alternative punishment of detention, except in the cases of so-called "conscientious objectors." Detention is a purely military punishment. It keeps a prisoner on Army work, and he is usually sent overseas as a free man long before the end of his sentence. In the field detention and discharge with ignominy are no longer awarded as punishments. A man is worth more as a fighter than as a prisoner or civilian. A common sentence is "field punishment No. 2," which sets a man on many fatigues for a short period under three months in duration, and does not deprive the firing-line of an effective rifle. In this way the claims of discipline have been reconciled with those of man-power.

Thirdly, the office of Courts-martial Officer has been created, with a view to keep Court-martial proceedings more free from legal blunders, and generally to assist General Officers Commanding on legal points. In France the Courts-martial Officer is usually a Captain and a junior member of the Court. He invariably records its proceedings, and is a shadowy Judge Advocate in practice. The advantages of having a trained lawyer in this position were so clear that on September 24th, 1916, forty-three such posts were established on home service for officers who belong to the legal profession, and more came into being later. Courts-martial Officers act in Great Britain as Judge Advocates (at General Courts-martial), as prosecutors, or as mere advisers, but their best function is that of actual members of Courts-martial. If of field rank, they can be used as standing Presidents of all District Courts-martial held in their own areas, and thus they not only conduct trials on proper legal lines, but they are also able to unify the standard of punishments, which are apt to vary greatly when in lay hands. Those who (like the writer during the year 1918) have had the good fortune to serve in this capacity under a General of magnanimous mind, will feel that these purposes have been well fulfilled.

The changes mentioned do not, however, touch fundamentals.

Military Law remains essentially the same, and few would assert that the nation in arms is as satisfied with its workings as was the old professional Army, who never found fault with their code of discipline. Much latter-day discontent is not due to any defect in the law. It arises simply in consequence of the mentality of individual judges. Courts have a wide discretion as to punishment, and where an offence is rather against discipline than against morals, the ideas of many old Army officers are on another plane to those of the amateur soldier. The remedy lies in the creation of a recognised standard of punishment in closer harmony with the spirit of our times. No man with war experience will be blind to this great need. On May 19th, 1917, X, a boy of sixteen, was sentenced at Sidestrand to a year's detention for striking a young Lance-corporal when in a temper. The Court recommended him to mercy. The sentence was confirmed and the recommendation ignored by the local General. On December 22nd, 1917, at Le Quesnoy, near Béthune, H, a Provost-Sergeant in charge of the 42nd Divisional prisoners' compound, with a long record of good service and only one entry against him in his conduct sheets, was sentenced for alleged drunkenness after the day's work, to be reduced to the ranks and to undergo one year's imprisonment with hard labour. The sentence was confirmed, though afterwards partially remitted. I know these to be the facts, as I was this man's "friend." The remedy for such abuses of justice lies in educating Courts to a better perspective as regards military crimes. Other abuses require more definite modes of reform.

I. One urgent administrative need is to secure greater independence for Courts-martial. In theory they are as free as air. The Manual directs them "not to allow themselves to be influenced by the consideration of any supposed intention of the convening officer." Nevertheless, the judgments of Courts are commonly fettered by their awe of a convening General Officer, whose preconceptions of what punishments should be awarded, and of what the Court's findings should be, are perfectly well known to each member. No judge is free when his professional future is wholly in the hands of a convening officer who has shown any warm interest in the Court's decisions. Here are some cases in point. At Suez, in May, 1916, all field officers of the 127th Infantry Brigade were directed to sentence any man convicted of drunkenness to not less than one year's imprisonment with hard labour, whatever his character might be. Two among them, who would not fall in with this drastic standard, were reported by the Brigadier as being "too kind-hearted to be efficient disciplinarians."

The same vice flourishes both at home and abroad. On March 20th, 1917, at Weybourne, K, who in the belief that he suffered from rupture, had disobeyed an order to take a high jump, was sentenced by a D.C.M. to twenty-eight days' field punishment. The G.O.C. circularised his command with a strongly expressed disapproval of the alleged leniency of this sentence, and at all subsequent D.C.M.s in that area, a copy of this circular was placed in front of the various Presidents. I saw it done. As recently as October 15th, 1917, at La Panne, two soldiers of the Manchester

Regiment, charged with trying to plunder an empty pancake shop, were acquitted by F.G.C.M., in the absence of any material evidence in support of the prosecution. The President happened to be a barrister of many years' experience. The 42nd Divisional Staff required the President to furnish forthwith in writing a full explanation of his conduct in allowing the acquittals to take place. Such interference is a gross tampering with the course of justice.

A Court has often to hear complaints in respect of the alleged inadequacy of its sentences from a Staff which has never seen or come in personal contact with the individuals concerned in the case, and which has no legal training or knowledge. Under any conditions the lot of a Military Court is unenviable. Nothing is more painful than to try some gallant and exhausted boy who has slept at his post; some blundering volunteer who has spoken foolishly in a moment of heat. If the members of a Court have thought fit to temper justice with mercy, it is abominable that they should be pestered by official protests against their actions. Such protests recall Stuart times, and should not be tolerated. "I can reason with the people of England," said Erskine when defending Tom Paine in 1792, "but I cannot fight against the thunder of authority."

II. No obstacle should be allowed to impede the accused's right to the services of a "friend." With all the good will which characterises Courts-martial, no President or prosecutor can possibly elicit as much in favour of the accused as a legally trained "friend" who commands his confidence. All impediments to this constitutional right should be penalised. At present it is absolutely secured in cases where death is a possible sentence, but in other cases it is rarely utilised, and its exercise is sometimes positively discouraged. At the Bournemouth Church Army Hut, Suez, on April 16th, 1916, in a lecture to the senior officers of the 42nd Division, the G.O.C. stated in my hearing that he objected to any of his officers appearing as "friends" when men of units under his command were being tried. It is difficult to realise that this General was fighting in a "war to end militarism."

III. The procedure of all Courts-martial (other than those in the field) involves great waste of time and labour. Everything said is recorded in longhand word for word, whether material or not, and at the end of every witness's statement, the President has to write down in full, "His evidence is read to the witness. R. 83 (B) complied with. The witness withdraws." When the accused gives evidence, the following has to be written: "The accused takes his stand at the place from which other witnesses give their evidence. The accused is duly sworn. The accused gives his evidence. . . . The evidence of the accused is read to him. R. 83 (B) complied with. The accused withdraws from the place from which he has given his evidence." A long footnote, to be written compulsorily in red ink, required in most cases of desertion and absence without leave, on page 1 of the proceedings, involves further drudgery. Field General Courts-martial do without this labour, which originated at a time when Presidents required constant reminders

as to practice, and it should be done away with on home service, too, now that trials are in more expert hands.

IV. Larger areas should be allotted to Courts-martial Officers on home stations, who are usually much under-employed, especially when not used as standing Presidents or members of all Courts-martial. What Gibbon called "the wandering life of military servitude" is dull enough without enforced idleness. For the first 246 working days of 1917, the Courts-martial Officer for the Sheringham area had no work of any description on 109 days.

V. The law's delay in bringing cases to trial before General Courts-martial is extraordinary, especially when contrasted with the admirable despatch that marks the procedure of District Courts-martial. Thus an officer placed under arrest at a home station on October 19th, 1918, on two simple charges of misconduct in a mess, was only tried on November 21st, 1918.

VI. We touch law, and not mere practice, with regard to the need to establish a more genuine trial by his peers in the case of an officer tried by General Courts-martial. As the law now stands, "the members of a Court-martial for the trial of an officer shall be of an equal, if not superior, rank to that officer . . . and in no case shall an officer under the rank of Captain be a member of a Court-martial for the trial of a field officer" [R.P. 21 (B)]. A footnote to this rule in the Manual states that "on the trial of a subaltern officer, two officers of subaltern rank will be a sufficient proportion to be detailed as members of the Court." The clear intention of the law is that a man should substantially be tried by his equals, neither by his juniors nor exclusively by his seniors. In practice, trial by peers is most uncommon. At the normal General Court-martial an officer is tried by an overwhelming proportion of senior officers—men in most cases belonging in their ideas and education to an entirely different age.

VII. Probably the most urgent reform required is in respect of the present utter inadequacy of the mechanism by which grievances can be redressed. This mechanism is described in Ss. 42 and 43 of the Army Act, King's Regulations adding to it a right to complain to an Inspecting General and (in the case of an officer), a right to interview the Military Secretary. S. 42 provides that if an officer cannot obtain justice from his C.O., he can apply through the C.O. and the usual further channels for the transmission of his complaint to the Army Council. S. 43 provides for a soldier's appeal to his Captain, from the Captain to his C.O., and from the C.O. to the General Officer Commanding. The vast majority of officers with grievances realise the hopelessness of an appeal from one authority to another authority, whose vested interest is to support whatever has been done. Failure leaves the complainant a marked man for life. Any fight with the powers that be means anxiety and official disfavour.

In the practice of our Army no redress is normally available in cases of unjust supersession. Promotion by selection is theoretically better than promotion by seniority. The pity is that it so often cloaks jobbery and injustice. It is, of course, difficult to challenge the discretion of a superior officer in the field. Even

Macaulay, when Secretary of War in 1841, felt bound to defend Lord Cardigan from well-deserved criticism on the ground that any interference with his exercise of patronage would "lead to the most fatal effects to the whole of our military system."

Nevertheless, it is only right that Parliament should devise means to guarantee officers and N.C.O.s against the wreck of their military careers, whether through mere caprice on the part of their superiors, or through defective information on the part of the War Office officials concerned in questions of promotion. This can be done by simplifying the existing machinery for complaints so as to admit of such amendment to the Army Act as will insure fair play without prejudicing discipline.

VIII. Military Law during the whole war failed to solve the problem of the "conscientious" objector to military service, who refuses to obey orders. The State has failed to achieve either of its objects—(i) to make the man a good soldier; or (ii) to render his lot permanently less pleasant than that of the man who did his duty as a citizen.

If the nation were ever again involved in war, any malcontent recruit should be separated immediately after enlistment from the company with whom he has in all probability joined up. Most cases of this kind have occurred among batches of men from areas particularly affected with Bolshevism. If the objector is removed from "evil communications" and thrown into the great fraternity of the Army, he has a better chance of finding his manhood.

Objectors who prove obdurate should be employed on genuine non-combatant war service while under sentence, and should be disfranchised for life. If of foreign nationality, like an affluent Italian hairdresser from Kentish Town, who stated that "I follow Trotzky and oppose a capitalists' war" when tried for disobedience on July 27th, 1918, they should be deported.

IX. No sketch of Military Law reform would be complete without a few words as to "Field Punishment No. 1." This involves the attachment of a prisoner in irons "for a period or periods not exceeding two hours in any one day to a fixed object; but he must not be so attached during more than three out of any four consecutive days, nor during more than twenty-one days in all." The fixed object is often a tree or a wheel. A Court-martial can impose this punishment for a period up to three months; a C.O. up to twenty-eight days. It is not given on home service, but it is only too common in the field. It means acute mental misery, as it is endured in the sight of a man's comrades, and often in full view of civilians of alien race. So long as the first-line Territorial units of 1914 retained their own field officers, they had no occasion to practise this grim relic of the Regular Army's penal code. The closing phase of a triumphant war waged "to make the world safe for democracy" might well witness its abolition.

GERALD B. HURST.

IMPRESSIONS OF SMYRNA IN WAR-TIME.

AFTER being interned in the interior of Asia Minor during the four years of the war, I arrived at Smyrna in September, 1918, and during the following months events of world-wide interest succeeded each other with startling rapidity.

Smyrna is the second city of the Turkish Empire, ranking after Constantinople in size and importance. It is connected with the interior by two lines of railroad, and the produce of a rich and fertile province is exported from its large and safe harbour. The city has a beautiful situation, extending round the shore of a long sweeping bay with a background of hills and mountains, but it enjoys few of the amenities of a modern European city. The streets are narrow, ill-kept, and without pavements, and when out walking one has difficulty in keeping clear of passing carts, carriages, and caravans of camels. There is a horse tramway service along the quays, but the cars move slowly and are always uncomfortably crowded.

The population is estimated at from three to four hundred thousand, but as the last census was taken by counting the houses, and then multiplying the number by five, the result is rather uncertain. The Turks call it the "Giaour" city, owing to the large proportion of Christian inhabitants—"Giaour" being an insulting term meaning dog. There are over 200,000 Greeks, the rest of the population being composed of Turks, Armenians, Jews, and colonies of Europeans. The British community at Smyrna numbers about 1,800, the members of which are engaged in banking, trading, teaching, nursing the sick, and in mission work. There are two English churches with officiating clergymen. A large hospital was built and equipped by the British Government for the use of the Mercantile Marine. During the war the hospital was taken by the Germans. The Turks seized the various mission schools and the hospital of the Scottish Mission, and have destroyed all the furniture and equipment of the buildings.

There is no doubt that Rahmy Bey, Vali of Smyrna, and Governor of the Province of Aidin, protected the British during the years of the war. He is a man of strong personality, and, it is said, refused to be Grand Vizier several times, preferring to be king in his province. When travelling from Afion to Smyrna, I heard some Germans in the railway carriage discussing the Vali and his Anglophil tendencies. One of them, who belonged to Smyrna, remarked: "Rahmy Bey is very rich, clever, and autocratic, and he rules the Province of Aidin like a king. He is very friendly with the English. The German Consul at Smyrna invited him to attend a Red Cross meeting at the German Consulate. The Vali came, remained five minutes, and then said he must leave, as he had an engagement to take tea with English friends at Bournabat." Is this friendship sincere, or is it based on self-interest? No one really knows, but it is certain that while British subjects in other parts of Turkey were deported to the Interior, and moved from place to place, suffering many hardships, none of the British in Smyrna were injured or exiled. Still, a Governor, for the sake of self-interest,

dare not neglect the orders from Constantinople, and during the war the British community had many trying experiences.

When British aeroplanes bombarded Smyrna the Englishmen were seized in the night-time and imprisoned in empty houses in different parts of the city. No information was given to the relatives, and the prisoners received neither food nor covering for the night. Their friends had the greatest difficulty in finding the houses in order to convey food and warm clothing to them. An English clergyman's house was searched and all his papers seized. He refused to disclose the name of a Greek, who had written out some particulars regarding the Greek persecutions of 1914. A Turkish official remarked, "He ought to be tortured till he tells."

The air-raids continued at intervals till 1917. A friend spoke of them as a terror to the community, Moslem and Christian alike. "I shall never forget the sound of the bombs as they whistled through the air, then the thud followed by explosion. There was a memorable fight between two British aeroplanes and a German one piloted by the famous aviator, Herr Buddecke. One of the British aeroplanes was brought down, and the airman, T——, was badly injured, his leg being broken; but he raised himself and kept the Turks at bay with his pistol, while his companion set fire to the aeroplane. The machine flared up in a great flame, he flung his pistol into the fire, and only then were the two men taken prisoners. In the meantime the air-fight was continuing. The German aeroplane flew over the remaining British aeroplane, which was finally shot and shattered. First fell the hapless bodies of the Englishmen like inanimate bundles, then came the slowly descending wings. The Turkish soldiers stripped the mangled corpses and sold the clothes as souvenirs. The bodies were exhibited to the crowd, a piastre being charged for the sight, and photographs were taken and sold. Immediately the Germans heard of these horrible proceedings they destroyed the plates and photographs, and ordered a military funeral. The funeral service was conducted at the English Church and the English Chaplain officiated. Numerous wreaths were sent, among them one from Herr Buddecke, with the inscription in letters of gold on a long silk scarf, 'Buddecke to his brave opponent.' Turkish marines bore the coffins, large numbers of English and Germans attended the funeral, and full military honours were paid to the fallen heroes. During the service Herr Buddecke circled above in his aeroplane. A few months later he fell in France. Let us pay all honour to the memory of a gallant and generous enemy!"

The British bombarded the fortified position on Mount Pagus from the sea for a week during the summer of 1917. The Turks became very excited, and rumours passed through the town that if the British tried to take Smyrna, the streets would run with blood and the city be set on fire. The three hundred British householders were ordered to call at the Government House. When they arrived they were sent as prisoners to the fortified position on Mount Pagus, where they had to remain for two weeks. One who was a prisoner told me, "It was touch and go with us all being massacred that morning, but during the next bombardment some scores of

Christians were killed. That pacified the Turks, who said 'the British are killing Moslems and Christians alike.' Fortunately for us Mount Pagus was not bombarded again, and everything quietened down. Rumour reported that Rahmy Bey had come to an understanding with the British admiral."

With regard to the native population the Vali was favourable to the Armenians, and comparatively few were deported, but the wealthy had to pay enormous sums in "backshish" for protection and permission to stay. On the other hand, Rahmy Bey is said to hate the Greeks. He is a native of Salonika, and his dislike dates from the time when the city was handed over to Greece. The Greeks in the Province of Aidin were bitterly persecuted, and over half a million were killed, and their property confiscated. There is no justice in Turkey, and far too much power is vested in the hands of the local governor, who can decree life or death to the people under him.

As the war continued the price of food and other necessities of life became exorbitant throughout Turkey. The supplies in the country were cornered by Turkish officials and merchants, who became wealthy at the expense of the general population. In Smyrna flour rose to 6s. an oke, an oke being equal to $2\frac{3}{4}$ lbs. weight. The "vesika" or ration bread, sold at a high price, was mud colour, and of such a bad quality that it made the people ill. Sugar cost £3 sterling an oke, coffee £8, and tea rose to £26 an oke; meat was very scarce, and cost 14s. an oke. Butter of inferior quality cost 45s. an oke, olive oil 36s., and petroleum cost about £3 an oke. The following is an example of Turkish methods of profiteering. Suddenly gas ceased to be supplied to the houses and streets, and it was reported throughout Smyrna that the Turkish officials had bought up a large quantity of petroleum and wished to sell it. The city remained without gas for a fortnight, and we had to revert to the ancient custom of taking a lamp with us when we went out at night.

The price of clothing became almost prohibitive. A simple suit of clothes, or a dress, cost from £40 to £60; a pair of boots or shoes, £20; a pair of boot laces, 4s.; a small reel of sewing cotton, 8s.; a yard of calico, over £1. Everything was expensive in proportion. The poor of the city died of starvation, those who lived on a fixed income had a bitter struggle, the Greek and Armenian shopkeepers made large fortunes, the Turkish officials who monopolised the supplies became millionaires. It was a period of cruel contrasts.

During September companies of British military prisoners arrived at Smyrna under the terms of the Berne Convention for the exchange of English and Turkish prisoners. They were the sick, the lame, the maimed, and many died soon after arrival, the journey to the coast having been too much for them. The British and Indian prisoners were stationed at Paradise, a short distance from Smyrna. They were strictly guarded by Turkish soldiers, and one did not dare to exchange even a word of greeting in case the imprisonment might be made more strict. Ere long all these conditions were to be changed.

The signing of the Bulgarian Armistice was announced at the end of September, but one always accepted news with reserve until further confirmation. It was impossible to obtain reliable information. A statement published one day in the newspaper was frequently contradicted the following day. Perhaps it was the necessary method of giving news, and at the same time propitiating the censor. The Bulgarian Armistice came as a surprise, and was an event far-reaching in its effects. The Turks became very uneasy. The newspapers stated that Germany had agreed to sign an Armistice with the Entente without considering the fate of Turkey. The papers vied with each other in publishing virulent articles against Germany, and her treachery in trying to get better terms for herself at the expense of the Turks. It was further stated that Germany had signed a secret treaty with Turkey not to make peace till all enemies had been expelled from the borders of the Turkish Empire.

About the middle of October the young Turk Cabinet, with Talaat Pasha as Grand Vizier, fell. After a short period of unrest he was succeeded by Izzet Pasha, who professed democratic sympathies. The Constantinople papers urged the necessity of Turkey arranging a separate peace in order to get better terms for herself. At this time Rahmy Bey, Vali of Smyrna, began to play a prominent part in peace negotiations. An interview was published on October 19th, in which he said:—

“ My opinion is that the current which cannot be resisted impels us to conclude peace, as soon as possible. I am convinced that the Government feels the necessity, because greater dangers will result from the delay of the conclusion of peace. Germany has made propositions of peace without considering the evacuation of our provinces occupied by the enemy. Consequently, the treaties concluded with Germany are annulled, and we are free to conclude peace as we wish.”

The interviewer having asked if the rumours were true that England would be favourably disposed towards Rahmy Bey, he replied:—

“ The British Government has expressed its thanks for the manner in which we have treated the British prisoners. I possess letters proving this. I have always considered that we took a false road. Unfortunately, events have shown that I was right. I have repeatedly declared to Talaat Pasha that we were injuring our country's interests by entering the present war.”

It was further stated that Rahmy Bey had held important interviews with various members of the Government. He had visited the Grand Vizier, Izzet Pasha, and discussed the question of the speedy conclusion of peace. Perfect accord had been reached on this subject. It was next reported that Rahmy Bey was arranging the terms of armistice with General Townshend, of Kut-el-Amara fame, who had been held a prisoner at Broussa. Then followed the news that they had travelled together to Smyrna, that they had been seen passing through the streets in an automobile, that they had dined

together at the house of a well-known British resident. Finally they had left for Mitylene, where the armistice would be discussed and signed. Words cannot convey the interest, excitement, and expectancy of these days, for an armistice meant safety and liberation to thousands—nay, millions of people throughout Turkey. The whole of Smyrna was discussing the coming armistice, and the doings of Rahmy Bey and General Townshend. On Friday, October 25th, the newspapers announced that the armistice between Turkey and the Entente had been signed, and that Rahmy Bey, Vali of Smyrna, had been deposed. Next day the newspapers denied that the armistice had been signed, but stated that accredited British and Turkish delegates were negotiating an armistice at Mudros. In the front page appeared a touching letter of farewell to his dear Smyrniots from Rahmy Bey, who left that day for Constantinople to give place to his successor. Later on we heard that he had conducted negotiations without permission from the Turkish Government, and had been deposed on that account. After many rumours and false reports it was stated that the Turkish armistice had been signed on October 30th, and twelve conditions were given. Next day half of them were contradicted. At Smyrna there were no expressions of public joy at the practical close of the war—no one felt sure that the report was true. The public rejoicings came later.

The newspapers continued to write against the Germans, and with such venom that it seemed as if the pens were dipped in vitriol instead of ink. With equal indignation they censured Talaat Pasha, Enver Pasha, and the Young Turk party who had led the country to ruin. They placed on Talaat and Enver the responsibility of the Greek and Armenian deportations and massacres. It was on the programme of the new Turkish Cabinet that no further deportations or massacres of Greeks and Armenians should take place; that reforms were to be introduced to ameliorate the condition of the Christian inhabitants; and that those responsible for the deportations and massacres should be punished.

Three Ottoman-Greek deputies prepared a statement to lay before the Turkish Parliament in which they desired to know "what measures will be taken against the persons who have exterminated one million Armenians, 550,000 Greeks, and deported 250,000 Ottoman-Greeks, and seized their goods and fortunes; who have caused the death by famine of 250,000 Ottoman-Greeks embodied in Labour regiments; who have transferred commerce into a monopoly, despoiled the people, killed deputies, ill-treated Arabs." At this time a long and cynical article appeared in a Constantinople paper urging the Turkish Government to use all their "suppleness" in pushing through the reforms for Greeks and Armenians, in order to show their sincerity to the Entente, and thus move them to give better peace conditions to Turkey.

Remarkable leaders appeared in the newspapers voicing the terrible sufferings and sorrows of the Armenians—doubly striking in a country like Turkey, where the oppressed Christians have had to remain patient and silent for centuries. The following extracts are from a newspaper article entitled "The Dead have Spoken":—

"We have had our hearts excited to indignation in reading in the newspapers of the capital and elsewhere the revolting persecutions, the barbarous treatment, and the numberless martyrdoms by which the unfortunate Armenian element had served as a prey during these last years. Alas! we can now explain to ourselves that tragic yet naïve question of a traveller re-entering Constantinople to a Turkish journalist, 'How! are there still Armenians here?'"

"Well, yes, there are still Armenians in Turkey, but there remain scarcely enough to weep for the thousands of their brothers, their throats cut by a herd of savage and bloody wolves. There remain scarcely enough to honour the memory of relatives, torn from home and home affections, to die miserably from hunger, sorrow, and cold, in the land of exile whence they will never return. . . .

"Armenians, dry your tears! The dead have spoken, listen to them. 'You have wept enough for us,' they say, 'it is now necessary that you revenge us.' Go! Armenian wives, denounce to the Government, who invites you, the names of the butchers who made you widows. And you Armenian mothers, demand boldly justice for the blood of your sons, and the honour of your daughters. . . . What! will you leave unpunished so many crimes? Will you shut your ears to the invitation of the authorities, who wish to show to civilised Europe, who is watching them, that they are able to punish the guilty, and to render justice to the Armenian nation. . . . Are you going indeed to refuse to respond to the voices from beyond the tomb, who cry vengeance? Take care, for it is sacrilege to refuse obedience to the dead, and the dead have spoken."

After the armistice events moved fast in Turkish political circles. On November 4th Talaat, Enver, Nazim, and other leading members of the Young Turk party fled to Odessa on board a Russian steamer. They sent this farewell message to the Grand Vizier, Izzet Pasha: "We are leaving, as it is impossible to be in Constantinople when the English fleet arrives." The Valis of Damascus, Aleppo, Aintab, and Diabekir also fled from the country. The newspapers openly stated that the Young Turks had enriched themselves by despoiling the people. Before Enver Pasha left Constantinople he forwarded £700,000 to his brother in the Caucasus, and he secretly sent hundreds of horses, oxen, and sheep to his farm. He attempted to change thousands of pounds of paper money into gold at the War Office, but his plan was frustrated. At this time the paper bank-notes had fallen to a fifth of their face value. From flour alone £60,000 had been daily embezzled by Government officials. A tax of £1 was levied on each sack of flour. It was stated that Enver Pasha and Talaat Pasha had become millionaires, and Rahmy Bey, ex-Vali of Smyrna, was richer than Abdul Hamid. A high Turkish military official attempted to smuggle eighty railway waggon loads of sugar from Austria into Turkey. The matter was brought to light and publicity under the new *régime*, and he fled to Odessa.

Complaint was also made that the country had been continuously deceived. The following are a few extracts from an article in the Turkish paper *Sabah*, entitled "Lies! Lies! Lies!"

" Our purpose is to prove that lies abound with us. Yet none of our statesmen have given themselves over in such a large measure as Talaat Pasha. This strange creature, who is ex-Grand Vizier, has passed his life in lying. I do not know the reason for this fact, but one may say that lying has formed the tactics of the former Cabinet. Must one see the cause in the influence of its chief? When the general war broke out, and mobilisation was decreed, all declared in favour of Germany, but our Cabinet published without shame that we would not depart from neutrality. After our entrance into the war the Government never published the fall of Van, Erzeroum, Trebizond, and of all our other vilayets, but continued to appoint valis and officials for these districts. It sought to conceal our misfortunes. At last the defeat and downfall were so complete that it was no longer possible to cover them with lies. And yet the Government still found means to lie. Djemal Pasha proclaimed that Jerusalem was a second Tchanak-kaleh, that the English would break their heads against the walls and retire, and declared finally that Jerusalem would not fall, that it could not fall. Yet Jerusalem had already fallen, and at the moment when these words were spoken the English were at Nablous. . . . When the English were marching on Damascus at a rapid pace, Enver publicly declared that this same Damascus was guaranteed from all danger. Certain journals, which drew their courage from these words, affirmed that from the manner in which it advanced, the English Army would take fifteen years to arrive at this town. Fifteen days later Damascus fell. . . . In a word, all that Talaat Pasha said, both to Europe and to us, was only lies. What the Grand Vizier said to the Chamber and to the Senate, what he said to Austria and to Germany, was all, in fact, only a string of lies, enough to make heaven and earth tremble."

At the beginning of November it was rumoured that the British battleships were coming to Smyrna. People had seen them steaming in from the distance. But this was impossible, as the mines had not yet been cleared from the harbour, and the Turks had blocked the entrance at the beginning of the war by sinking two British ships. In preparation for the event the Greeks made hundreds, perhaps thousands of flags. A Greek friend told me that a Greek Church had spent £300 in making a large silk flag embroidered with gold, and that Greek families were expending from £20 to £30 in preparing flags. This was not improbable with the high cost of material.

On Wednesday, November 6th, the British Monitor, 29, entered Smyrna harbour about half-past one o'clock. Immediately the whole population went wild with excitement and enthusiasm. The streets were thronged with crowds of men, women, and children, wearing their national colours, and waving little flags. Overhead fluttered the gay coloured flags of many nations—British, American, French, Italian, a few Turkish, one or two Armenian, and a multitude of blue and white Greek flags. When the officers of the Monitor came ashore, Commander Allen Dixon was mounted shoulder-high, and carried in triumph through the streets, while the people shouted "Vive l'Angleterre, Vive l'Entente." It

was like the reception of a relieving army by a beleaguered city. The enthusiasm continued all evening. From the crowded cafés on the quays echoed the strains of "God Save the King" and the Marseillaise. The searchlight from the ship played along the sea-front, illuminating the happy and excited faces of the multitudes. It was touching to see the reception accorded to this small British warship—so insignificant in itself, but the people hailed it as a symbol of British justice and protection.

In connection with similar rejoicings, a Constantinople newspaper wrote:—

"What a disaster for the Ottoman Empire is the defeat of Syria. It far surpasses the dimensions we might have supposed. But what afflicts us most is that at Beyrout, at Damascus, everywhere, the enemy has been received by the population with open arms, and with great manifestations of joy. If that is true, what a shame for the Ottomans. What has become of the bond which exists between Moslems? How have we forgotten that all the faithful are brothers? Whose is the fault? We are only reaping what we have sown. In the French journals we read that in Syria an Armenian battalion had marched against the Turks in the ranks of the enemy, under the command of French officers. An English Minister sends a letter to Boghos Nubar Pasha, in which in the name of England he makes such promises to the Armenians, he undertakes such engagements towards them, that if these promises and engagements are carried out at the time of peace, what will become of the country and Ottoman independence?"

The joyful demonstrations in Smyrna angered the Turks, but Commander Allen Dixon at once took hold of the situation, and next day the following proclamation appeared in the newspapers and was posted over the town, printed in English, French, Italian, and Greek.

"Although the demonstrations in honour of the Allied men-of-war are much appreciated, the population must not lose sight that peace has not yet been arranged, and that we have come here to work at the opening of the port, and to safeguard the interests of the Allies. Consequently, all demonstrations must cease.

"A. DIXON.

"Commander of the Royal British Marine.

"Commander-in-Chief of the Allied Fleet.

"H.M.S. 29.

Smyrna, 6th November, 1918."

Already Turkish fanaticism was at its old methods of suppression. At Soma, north of Smyrna, some Greek schoolboys were beaten to death for singing national songs. In the city the Turkish police were entering houses and churches to order the removal of flags, and were beating and insulting the inmates. Complaint was made to Commander Dixon, and he at once telephoned to Government House, and the persecution ceased. Laudatory articles appeared in the Smyrna newspapers praising Commander Dixon's tact, dignity, and amiability. English official *communiqués* were published daily in the newspapers.

After the announcement of the Turkish armistice British and Indian prisoners came from the Interior in hundreds, and the streets were thronged with officers and soldiers. It was good to see them.

Each man could tell a thrilling tale of peril and hardship, for the majority had suffered from Turkish ill-treatment. But none complained, and there was a humorous touch in many of the stories, for life in Turkey is always a mixture of the tragic and grotesque. Football matches between British teams became a feature in Smyrna amusements. The British Consulate was once more opened with the Union Jack floating overhead, and we were able to post letters home at the military Post Office. Eager crowds of released prisoners read the sympathetic letter from King George posted up at the Consulate. The longing for home in the hearts of all was soon to be satisfied, and crowded troopships carried the soldiers to their homes in the East and the West.

During my journey homewards I remained several weeks in Alexandria. After the famine, desolation, and human misery in Turkey, Alexandria seemed like an earthly paradise with its palm-lined streets, the gardens gay with flowers, and the general appearance of peace, plenty, and prosperity. It was indeed a joy to be once more under the shelter of the Union Jack. In Alexandria I heard of some of the splendid relief work that is being carried on by the British military authorities. During the progress of the Army through Palestine the destitute population at Jerusalem, Beyrout, Damascus, and Aleppo were fed and helped, our soldiers sharing their rations with the starving. At Aleppo 30,000 Armenian widows and orphans are being helped and clothed by the British military authorities and the Red Cross Society. A large camp has been organised at Port Said, where thousands of Armenian refugees have been kept since 1915. At present there are 6,000 men, women, and children being fed and clothed. A hospital is provided for the sick, and schools have been arranged for the education of the children.

At Bakuba, thirty miles north of Bagdad, there is a large camp containing 60,000 Armenian refugees, who survived the horrors of deportation. The tents have been pitched on both sides of the river Diala, a tributary of the Tigris. The people were collected by the British forces on the borders of Persia, in the district of Mosul, and as far west as Hit. They were sent south on motor lorries, and then conveyed over the railroad, which the British have now completed as far as 170 miles north of Bagdad. When the Armenians first arrived they were like skeletons, and the soldiers were put on half rations in order to provide food for the starving people. Our men cheerfully accepted the arrangement as a matter of course. A British General, who six months ago was studying redoubts and fortifications, is now organising Armenian orphanages. No wonder that the oppressed peoples, throughout the Near East, are praying for British protection. They realise that our troops occupy countries not as conquerors and oppressors, but as those who have come to help the perishing.

It is like the fulfilment of the ancient prophecy: "They shall build the old wastes, they shall raise up the former desolations, and they shall repair the waste cities, the desolations of many generations."

ANNIE C. MARSHALL.

MILTON AND MUSIC.

IT has been said that Music began where language left off, and as "means of expression" that remains their true relationship.

Music originates from several causes, which may be grouped, however, under two heads, namely, the desire to give expression to certain emotions, and the impulse so to express oneself by means of the human voice, or by some invented instrument. Innumerable effects are produced by Music on different listeners. The dual origin of Music may be traced in the broad distinction we inevitably make between what we may designate "music which is interpreted by the true musical artist through the symbolism of metaphors and emotions" and music which is produced simply and solely for the purposes of entertainment.

With the evolution of language, and as soon as it became capable of dealing in abstractions, Music evolved, becoming far more subtle, and beginning to express shades or extremes of emotion which words possess no power to express. Nietzsche has some very cogent and suggestive remarks on the subject of "Music and Words." "The lyric poet interprets music to himself through the symbolic world of emotions, whereas he himself is exempted from those emotions."

"When, therefore, the musician writes a setting to a lyric poem he is moved as musician neither through the images nor through the emotional language in the text; but a musical inspiration coming from quite a different sphere chooses for itself that song-text as allegorical expression. There cannot therefore be any question as to a necessary relation between poem and music; for the two worlds brought here into connection are too strange to one another to enter into more than a superficial alliance; the song-text is just a symbol, and stands to music in the same relation as the Egyptian hieroglyph of bravery did to the brave warrior himself. During the highest revelations of music we even feel involuntarily the crudeness of every figurative effort and of every emotion dragged in for purposes of analogy; for example, the last quartets of Beethoven quite put to shame all illustration and the entire realm of empiric reality. The symbol, in face of the god really revealing himself, has no longer any meaning; moreover, it appears as an offensive superficiality."

If a thought or an emotion can be expressed in words, poetry is its true and natural medium; if it is impossible for its creator or author thus to express it, he may still be able to express it in music. It is hardly necessary to point out that the boundary line between music and poetry is but ill defined, and often crossed in either direction, the musical composer attempting to body forth that which might more fittingly be expressed in words, and the poet haltingly attempting to shape in words that which can only find adequate expression in musical movement of one kind or another.

In the early stages of Music and Poetry, those arts were so closely united that all the lyric, elegiac, and even epic poets were "necessarily and professedly" musicians. Homer repeatedly describes

for us feasts and banquets, and in all of those descriptions we have music and a bard. The gods themselves, so Homer leads us to believe, delight themselves exceedingly in the music offered in the voice and lyre of Apollo and the Muses.

In speaking of Demodocus, Homer has taken occasion to exalt the character of poet and bard to the summit of human glory. The hospitable king of the Phæacians, in order to entertain Ulysses, says:—

“ Let none to strangers honours due disclaim ;
Be there Demodocus, the bard of fame,
Taught by the Gods to please, when high he sings
The vocal lay responsive to the strings.”

Pope observes upon this passage, that Homer shows in how great request music was held in the courts of all the eastern princes ; he gives a musician to Ithaca, another to Menelaus at Lacedæmon, and Demodocus to Alcinoüs.

Stray allusions to music as a simile or metaphor of enchantment, sweetness, &c., are so common in the poets that there would be no end to their discussion. But there is more than enough of genuine intimacy between the arts of music and poetry. Milton is one of the most obvious cases. He had musical art often in his mind ; and we have every reason to conclude that he himself was a good and learned musician. His allusions are precise and definite ; and his references reveal the sensitive and accomplished practical musician in him. What sensitive appreciation of musical tone, form, or colour, for example, is revealed in this passage from “ Paradise Lost ” (Book V.) :—

“ That day, as other solemn days, they spent
In song and dance, about the sacred hill—
Mystical dance, which yonder starry sphere
Of planets, and of fixed, in all her wheels
Resembles nearest ; mazes intricate,
Eccentric, intervolved, yet regular
Then most when most irregular they seem ;
And in their motions harmony divine
So smooths her charming tones that God’s own ear
Listens delighted.”

In the Elizabethan period of literature Music is the art most intimately allied to poetry. Milton, who may be said to close that period, was drenched in music, and is notable among all our poets for his love and knowledge of it. He was brought up in an atmosphere saturated with music. John Milton, the father of the poet, though a scrivener by profession, was a voluminous composer, and equal in science, if not genius, to the best musicians of his age, in conjunction and on a level with whom his name and works appeared in numerous musical publications of the times. His son celebrates his musical abilities in an admirable Latin poem, “ Ad Patrem,” where, alluding to his father’s musical science, he

says that Apollo had divided his favours in the sister arts between them, giving music to the father, and poetry to the son.

That Milton put some stress on music as an educative influence is shown in his paper on Education. In the Course of Study he outlines, among other necessary exercises of body, mind, and soul, he recommends "the exact use of their weapon." After the inevitable fatigue of practice in "guarding," "striking," "wrestling," they will need rest and recreation. So, "the interim of unsweating themselves regularly, and convenient rest before meat, may, both with profit and delight, be taken up in recreating and composing their travailed spirits with the solemn and divine harmonies of music, heard or learned; either while the skilful organist plies his grave and fancied descant in lofty fugues, or the whole symphony with artful and unimaginable touches adorns and graces the well-studied chords of some choice composer; sometimes the lute or soft organ-stop waiting on elegant voices, either to religious, martial, or civil ditties, which, if wise men and prophets be not extremely out, have a great power over dispositions and manners, to smooth and make them gentle from rustic harshness and distempered passions. The like also would not be inexpedient after meat, to assist and cherish nature in her first concoction, and send their minds back to the study in good tune and satisfaction."

We have probably no nobler references in all literature to music as a metaphysical symbol than in the following quotations; the only comparable passage in English to that in the Arcades being the opening of Dryden's great Cecilian ode.

I.

"Ring out, ye crystal spheres!
Once bless our human ears,
If ye have power to touch our senses so;
And let your silver chime
Move in melodious time;
And let the bass of heaven's deep organ blow;
And with your ninefold harmony
Make up full consort to the angelic symphony."
On the Morning of Christ's Nativity.

II.

The Genius of the Wood speaks:—

"Such sweet compulsion doth in music lie,
To lull the daughters of Necessity,
And keep unsteady Nature to her law,
And the low world in measured motion draw
After the heavenly tune, which none can hear
Of human mould with gross unpurged ear.
And yet such music worthiest were to blaze
The peerless height of her immortal praise
Whose lustre leads us, and for her most fit,
If my inferior hand or voice could hit
Inimitable sounds."

Arcades.

III.

"Blest pair of Sirens, pledges of Heaven's joy,
 Sphere-born harmonious sisters, Voice and Verse,
 Wed your divine sounds, and mixed power employ,
 Dead things with inbreathed sense able to pierce;
 And to our high-raised phantasy present
 That undisturbed song of pure concent,
 Aye sung before the sapphire-coloured throne
 To Him that sits thereon
 With solemn shout and solemn jubilee."

At a Solemn Music.

In the extracts which follow we have psychological allusions to music of great beauty and felicity of expression, and which indicate great depth of insight and thought.

"And ever against eating cares,
 Lap me in soft Lydian airs,
 Married to immortal verse,
 Such as the meeting soul may pierce,
 In notes with many a winding bout
 Of linked sweetness long drawn out
 With wanton heed and giddy cunning,
 The melting voice through mazes running,
 Untwisting all the chains that tie
 The hidden soul of harmony."

L'Allegro.

"And, as I wake, sweet music breathe
 Above, about, or underneath,

There let the pealing organ blow,
 To the full-voiced quire below,
 In service high and anthems clear,
 As may with sweetness, through mine ear,
 Dissolve me into ecstasies,
 And bring all Heaven before my eyes."

Il Penseroso.

"Who would not sing for Lycidas? he knew
 Himself to sing, and build the lofty rhyme.
 He must not float upon his watery bier
 Unwept, and welter to the parching wind
 Without the meed of some melodious tear.

Begin, then, Sisters of the sacred well
 That from beneath the seat of Jove doth spring;
 Begin, and somewhat loudly sweep the string,
 Hence with denial vain and coy excuse."

Lycidas.

In Milton, almost perhaps as much as in Campion, we have the real marriage of poetry and music: music not wholly a thing to allude to, but a profoundly formative influence on the art of poetry. Milton may be said to have produced a veritable interpretation of musical and poetic technique. As Mr. Laurence Binyon says of him, "It is the unmatched organ-music of his rhythm, never failing, whatever the level of his subject-matter, which sets him apart from all others who have written in blank verse."

A. H. MONCUR SIME.

LITERARY SUPPLEMENT.

LIST OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
1. THE ENDING OF THE ROAD. By J. E. G. DE M. ...	341
2. REVIEWS	345
THE CITY OF TROUBLE; THE PRELUDE TO BOLSHIEVISM; PLOTINUS AND MYSTICISM; BISMARCK AND WILLIAM II.; A GERMAN LEAGUE OF NATIONS.	
3. SHORTER REVIEWS:—"Crime and Criminals," &c. ...	355
4. NOTICES OF BOOKS	358

THE ENDING OF THE ROAD.

FIVE Springs ago the never-ending road which winds its way out of the forest, spinning its spell as it goes, was dreaming of an immemorial past and calling up spirits from the vasty deep of unnumbered centuries. It was a lonely forest and the moorland that made part of it seemed even lonelier than the endless aisles. The brackish creek that ran in from the sea and clove the moorland asunder on its southern side, held, here and there, a ghostly barge, and near the waters were a few reclaimed meadows where gipsies encamped. The rare folk that trod these lonely ways seemed attuned to the spirit of solitude, and the grizzled ferryman who plied his leaky boat across the creek seemed like the ferryman of the fairy tales. One day he would leap on the bank leaving his oars in the hands of a traveller, who would become a ferryman for ever and ever in the timeless land where the plover sadly calls the tides in from the sea to listen to the sighing of the wind in the inscrutable woods, mystery calling to mystery as is Nature's wont. Five years ago. Then all was suddenly changed.

The quiet earth took on her phase of terrible passion. The cry of a great wrong ran like woodland fire through the world and roused the sleepers, a wrong, brutal, bloody, faithless and cynical, a wrong that threatened the freedom of man in every land and the liberty of all nations. At first men, and even nations, disbelieved that such a thing could be, shut their ears, and their eyes, and their souls to this terrible thing, this sudden hurling of massed millions of fighting men on unprepared nations, with instructions to slaughter and burn, and ravage, and so secure through the sudden horror of the deed a relentless hold on the riches and liberties of the earth. So instantaneous was the crime, so well-favoured was the criminal, so far-reaching were the tentacles of this human octopus, that for a time there were men and nations that doubted, or pretended to doubt—or were too fearful to admit—the horror of the crime that Germany had committed against Belgium, who was her ward, against France whom she had wronged in other years. But England was not one of

these, and the land of England turned from her dreams and her sloth to slay the octopus who was poisoning the earth—the hydra of modern times.

Herculean task enough, and for four bitter years the task took its appointed course. The record is written with letters of fire in many millions of aching hearts. And if the homes of England are filled with proud desolation, so, too, is the nation as a whole. It has been with Daniel through the fiery furnace, walking therein with God, and, despite all that is written to the contrary, has come forth cleansed, with shining eyes looking to that future which the dead have made possible. School, and chapel, and church keep the dead in living remembrance. Above the list of the fallen in the great schoolroom at Wiltwater the headmaster put up the lines:

“ Those whose names are written here
Entered Silence without fear.
Now they speak with golden tongue.
Listen ! They, like you, were young.”

For more than four years the slaying of the hundred heads went on, with ever two heads of evil springing forth from the place whence one was hewn. But at last genius, resolve, faith, brought the end, and on the never-ending road which through all these years had been hammered by hoofs and wheels and tramping feet of war, the old silence fell. For a time it was followed by returning troops, and many a home-coming army retraced the footsteps of those men who had gone down to the little sea-port to return no more. For a time the sounds and weapons of war rolled along the ancient road, but less and less was it used, and the Armistice Winter passed and gave back to the Spring a solitary road. The road returned to its thinking, but it was not the same road and never would be again. The new experience had absorbed the old, and though nothing was altered, though the bend of the road and the sky-line of trees and the glimpses of water, of hilly copses, of bright green marsh were the same, though the wild geese flew as high and the sparrow-hawk called as clear, yet nothing was the same since the spirits that haunted it were changed spirits, and all old things were made new.

In the far, far days before the war the spirits of the road loitered and communed with one another, and re-enacted this deed or that deed of interminable centuries. At times their antics were so boisterous that human eyes could see them, but the dreams of the road were not purposeful, they were dreams and nothing more. But now the spirits were changed. They put by their dreaming and fain would live indeed, would play a part in the purpose of the race, since the race in the great quest of the great war had shown that it had a purpose, and not for itself only but for the world. How could they show it, these spirits of dead men and women who had trodden the road since the days of the Roman or earlier, down even to these latter days of unquenchable hope? So as the first burst of Spring ran through the forest and the moor, through the lowlands and the uplands, the bartons where the sheep graze, the meadows where the kine are, the spinny where the fox-cubs dwell, the tall firs whence the

hawks are calling, the swaying larches where in the feathery first green the linnets are singing, the spirits went forth together, a wonderful legion of them more musical than the lark, to find the Ending of the Road where the purpose of things should be seen. How far, said the Briton to the Roman; how far, said the Roman to the Jute; how far, said the Jute to the Dane; how far, said the Dane to the Norman; how far, said they all to the Briton; how far is the Ending of the Road?

And as they went, a blessed company that had no tears, they saw that a new world was in the making. The country side grew glad as they swept along it; the sadness of it, the waste of life in hapless villages, the unpreparedness, the unfruitful solitude changed as they winged along. A new joy had touched churches, chapels, schools, and cots. The little children glowed with the health that was their birthright; the youths and maidens walked with knowledge, which is truth and hope, in their happy eyes; the men walked with a new assurance of the dignity of life, the women with a new vision of the holiness of things. Every man's hand was against the things of evil. Every man's hope was fixed on other man's good. The moving scene was no transitory vision, for as villages glided into towns, and the endless road wound its way through great places of production; still the spirits saw hope shining in the eyes of men, and a freshness as of the morning on the foreheads of the crowd. The hovel and the slum had gone, the demons of disease had been tracked out of their lairs, the angels of thought and poetry had taken up their dwelling-place with men. At last the gates of things beautiful had been thrown open not only to the poor but to the rich, and the values of life had become manifest at last to those whose eyes want or wealth had for centuries bound up. So the company of spirits passed on and they were happy, for they knew that this was no dream, no vision of an impossible heaven, but a change that had been wrought by a change of heart, not by any doctrine of revolution, not by any devilish policy of hatred between class and class, but by the joint determination of men under the stress of unexampled things to find out by knowledge, by sympathy, by reason, by love, the way to a better and yet not impossible world.

And the Endless Road ran on through all the glories and the shining places of England, that jewel of the sea, and the spirits of the road winged along it in search of the Ending of the Road. They no longer asked how far, but they wondered whether the end would come by some cathedral mystic in its holy twilight, where the rolling of incommunicable music would touch the soul with the sense of the presence of God; or whether it would come on some mountain top, sun smitten at the close of day, whence they could see the Promised Land. But their astonishment was great when at last they saw, in a little dip of wonderful hills, the road suddenly end. It was a mysterious green spot with patches of woodland shining with the sunlight in the grey-green foliage. The road stopped in the grass and there was an end. Not even a path ran on or a sheep-track. And just by the spot where the road ended was a signpost, so like a cross, that at a little distance it seemed that it was a cross. And it was near this spot that all the roads of all the land had ending. And the

spirits from all the roads of all the land rose in the air above the signpost, and winged higher and higher till they were lost to view in the glow of the rising moon and setting sun.

* * * * *

The Bishop of Wiltwater told the parable to his young men of all classes who sat with him in his palace at Wilchester after supper on a Sunday evening. "It is a sort of folk-story, isn't it?" said one young man with some compassion in his voice. "Yes," said the Bishop; "I suppose it is. It was told me by a man who thinks that folk lore is race-memory. Do any one of you believe in race-memory?" They thought, and smoked, and smoked, and thought, and then Jasper said: "Yes, of course, race-memory is real enough, but what is worrying me, and I think all of us, is the complement to race-memory. If there is memory of a race as a whole there is looking forward as a whole. Do we look forward as a whole?" The Bishop lit his pipe and sipped his coffee. He had expected the question but hesitated as to the answer. Presently he said, "Race-memory comes up from the period of folk-communities. These stories of the road are stories of the movings and wanderings of communities. Race-anticipation must look forward to a period of communities. That is right, isn't it, Wilfred?" The boy who had been deep in Maine, said: "It sounds right, sir." "Well, but if it is right it surely means that we are moving towards a period of voluntary association again, an age of mutual help, a time when the State will be merely an instrument of perfecting the imperfect status of the individual, as in the Roman age. Isn't that so?" "Yes," said another youth, with an eager manner, "but if that is so what purpose do we find in it all? It is like a spiral. We mount but where do we mount to?"

"Yes, that is my difficulty, too," said the Bishop. "Can anyone suggest a solution? Light pipes and think." So they thought and thought, and while they thought the Bishop watched them. This to him was ideal, this thinking on equal terms with all sorts and conditions of youth, this clashing of minds, this feeble but therefore priceless feeling out after truth. At last one young man spoke. He said, "Can there be purpose that is not personal? Can there be race-purpose, or purpose unrelated to any individual? I don't believe there can." "Oh! but that's nonsense," said the Bishop. "Have you ever seen one mind move a crowd?" "Yes, but he gives his purpose to the crowd." "I know, but the crowd must have some quality of receptivity, some inchoate purpose. He could not give his purpose to a crowd of symbols. Do you see?" "Yes, I see," said the youth; "curious that I never saw it before. I see too now the end of the parable. I suppose Christ shows the purpose and some of us, a few of us, are capable of taking it." "All of us," said the Bishop; "that is just the difference between us and the symbols." "Let me see," said the boy, rubbing his forehead. "Tell us again the end of the story," and the Bishop with a smile stood in front of the fire and said: "The Road stopped in the grass and there was an end. Just by the spot where the Road ended was a great

signpost, so like a Cross that at a little distance it seemed that it was a Cross. And near this very spot all the Roads of all the land had ending. And the spirits from all the Roads of all the land rose in the air above the Cross, and winged higher and higher till they were lost in the glow of the setting sun." "Was there no one left?" "Oh, I had forgotten," said the Bishop, "the whole point of the story. There was a child looking up with beaming eyes under the signpost, laughing and clapping his hands in the warm spring weather."

J. E. G. DE M.

REVIEWS.

THE CITY OF TROUBLE.*

Miss Meriel Buchanan's book will, we think, prove a very useful footnote to history, since it reveals with great literary charm and very often acute insight, Petrograd as it was (and is) during the night of terror which has fallen upon Russia. History often fails to reveal the psychology of a people or a movement, because it is ignorant of the surface life and the inner life of the time. Many great historians, including Gibbon, have striven to reproduce these things in order to give verisimilitude to their work; have reconstructed the surface life and have peered into the inner social life of a period, in order to make explicable great movements otherwise obscure. To-day we have the newspaper which, used discreetly, will be invaluable for those purposes to the historian; but at times the news sheets fail, and, to be frank, they have often failed during the war to reflect the nature of popular emotion. In Russia they have failed almost entirely, and here we get a narrative from an eyewitness that more than takes their place.

Miss Buchanan, of course, had unique opportunities of surveying the position, and she is admirably attuned to the Russian landscape, city-landscape, mind-landscape. Her description of Moscow in this book, at the time when the Tzar, on August 23rd, 1914, attended the service for victory in the ancient Uspensky Cathedral, is of high value. The passage through the Kremlin with its endless halls and rooms "painted with dim old mosaics and wonderful burnished gold," until the terrace and the Red Staircase is reached, is so described as to make the reader feel that he is moving in the world of a Russian folk story, with its Slav and Asiatic wonders intermingled:—

"When the Emperor appeared on the top of the long flight of stairs, as if at some unspoken signal, all that great crowd, workmen and citizens, merchants and peasants, soldiers, women and

* *Petrograd (The City of Trouble)*. By Meriel Buchanan (daughter of the British Ambassador). (W. Collins Sons & Co. Ltd. 7s. 6d. net.)

children, went down on their knees, and from them rose a sound that broke against the ancient walls like the waves of a tremendous sea, that echoed and re-echoed, swelled, died down, and burst out again. For some of them were cheering, some were sobbing, some—with streaming eyes fixed on that small majestic figure descending the great stairs—were singing the National Anthem, the hymn for the Sovereign's safety. Slowly between that kneeling throng of people the Emperor passed, so near that by stretching out a hand those close to the pathway kept for him could have touched him. And there was nobody to guard that path, no policeman or soldier to keep back that seething, overwhelming mass of people. By now nearly all the crowd were singing the National Anthem, singing it in broken, faltering voices, with tears choking their utterance; while here a woman lifted a child in her arms, there a soldier bent his head low over his clasped hands as if he dared not look, and an old woman near the pathway bent to kiss the ground as the Emperor passed."

This scene is significant for the historian. There was no sign of the tragic end. But from the first the Germans were working to destroy the Tzardom, and their agents were more powerful than their swords. Professor Oman has made it clear in the last few days that vital facts were persistently kept from the Tzar by his pro-German Ministers. Miss Buchanan sweeps away with contempt the infamous stories (which were spread by German agents) about the Court and about the unhappy Empress and her daughters. It was, in fact, necessary for Germany to disorganise Russia, and the easiest way to do this was to destroy the Tzardom. That the Tzar was loyal to his people and loyal to his Allies Miss Buchanan makes perfectly clear. She denies emphatically that the Empress was in German pay or worked for German interests. She unwisely stood for a policy of repression, and "Germany used her as an unconscious tool, encouraging this Government of repression while they preached revolution throughout the country." The so-called Rasputin scandal did not exist, though the man himself was an abominable villain, and seems himself to have started the rumours. But the Empress, who led the simplest life possible at Czarskoe, "looked on Rasputin as a saint, and believed that by his prayers he would save the life of her son." The Imperial family were untainted in any way; the Court of Russia, so far from being splendid, was a life of seclusion. "The Emperor's daughters were brought up just like English girls, and the life they led resembled very much the life in some big secluded country house." The whole family has passed into history, murdered by the gangs of criminals whom the ex-Kaiser and his Government fostered. The tragedy of the dissolution of Russia and the murder of her Emperor and his family is in certain respects a story more tolerable than that of the last of the Hohenzollerns, who, having destroyed by corruption and intrigue his own Empire as well as that of Russia, is passing out of history as a fugitive criminal in alien lands. Nicholas was a king to the last, and, the victim of intrigue, he never lost his honour or his soul. William, an intriguer and a coward, never had either to lose.

When the terrible news of the revolution in Petrograd was running round the world the Emperor, almost by chance, returned to his capital. His cry, "Why was I not told of all this earlier?" reveals the man but also the weakness of autocracy. An autocrat can always be deceived. Nicholas, in the circumstances, did the right thing, and on March 14th, 1917, he abdicated. The Grand Duke Michael declined the succession until unanimously elected by the wish of the people. What the people wanted was summed up in a conversation between two soldiers: "What we want is a Republic," "Yes, a Republic, but we must have a good Tzar at the head of it." What Russia needed and needs is a Constitutional Monarchy, with a head in whom the passionate loyalty of the people can repose. Instead they have the monstrous Lenin and Trotsky and the German-begotten Bolsheviks. The evil influence of Germany, with its traditions of brutal autocracy, made the growth of constitutionalism in Russia impossible. A well-organised, happy Russia was what Germany dreaded more than anything else. So she played, and not only during the war, for a continuation of reaction and revolution in Russia. Germany sowed the wind and is reaping the whirlwind.

How great Russia was during the first two and a half years of war, despite all evil influences and disorganisation, is made plain in these pages. The women of Russia were wonderful, and Miss Buchanan writes with truth: "There is not one of them that has not been called upon for sacrifice, and what the war has not taken the Revolution has—in blood and iron and fire." It is foolish to say that "Russia let us down in the war." The Revolution made an end to her effort certain, but what she had sacrificed for freedom and right is immeasurable, and had it not been for Russia's efforts in the early days Germany would have had her wicked will with Europe. But the Revolution came in 1917. In July the Bolsheviks were at work, as in this year, 1919, they have been trying to be at work in England. Here the task was impossible, as the English are a more or less educated people. In Russia it was possible, for the people are ignorant and were at the mercy of the skilled agents of Germany. We get in this book a striking picture of the weak idealist Kerensky "hesitating to strike a crushing blow at the insidious evil of Bolshevism that was spreading like a disease through the ranks of the army." Iron measures must be taken with Bolshevism wherever it appears. This is being done in the United States; it will be done here if necessary. In Russia it was not done, and the German goal was achieved. Miss Buchanan shows us how the propaganda ruined the great Russian army. The Tzar was the real central point of the land; if his personality could have been supplemented by a strong Constitution all would have been well. But in August, 1917, Kerensky sent Nicholas and his family to Tobolsk, in Siberia, and tried to govern in his stead. He fell in November, 1917, without a friend—he who had been the hero of the crowd—and he was succeeded by the Bolsheviks, while the legend of a martyred Tzar whose prayers would

save Russia began to spread through the land. So we come to the German peace of Brest-Litovsk and the final ruin of Russia, the reign of the Red Guard and the anarchy of Petrograd. It was and is indeed a City of Trouble.

" Sometimes, looking out of the window late at night, one might have imagined oneself in a City of the Dead. The huge empty square, white and ghastly under the light of one feeble lamp; the vast shadow of the bridge across the frozen river, by the corner of the Marble Palace; the orange glow of the fire, where the forms of two or three soldiers could be seen crouching close to the flames. Now and then only the grey shadow of a sledge slipping silently across the snow or a muffled figure that passed swiftly as if it feared pursuit."

In this silent figure we see the passing of the glory that once was Russia. That the glory will return we do not doubt, for the world needs a new and wonderful Russia in which the old faith, patience and idealism of a great people will be reinforced by education and by hope.

* * *

THE PRELUDE TO BOLSHEVISM.*

This interesting book consists of an edition annotated by M. Kerensky himself of his evidence as to the Kornilov rebellion given before a Special Commission of Inquiry, appointed by the Russian Provisional Government on October 8th, 1917. The chairman of the Commission was M. Shablovsky, the chief Military and Naval Prosecutor, and the committee comprised three appointed members and two representatives of the Central Executive Committee of the Soviet of Soldiers' and Workmen's deputies. The examination took place at the Winter Palace at Petrograd. The importance of the evidence is that it explains, or purports to explain, the rebellion of General Kornilov, which, though it failed, is alleged to have let loose by reaction those forces of Bolshevism which have destroyed Russian democracy and undone the revolution against Tzardom.

The facts of the case are simple. The Russian front was broken by the Germans near Tarnopol on July 19th, 1917, and General Brussilov was replaced by General Kornilov, an impetuous leader but in favour of the cessation of a further offensive and in sympathy with Soldiers' Soviets and elective organisations. M. Kerensky, in his evidence and notes, attempts to reverse the popular estimate of many Russian generals, and speaks contemptuously of the capacity of Brussilov, a leader who was highly regarded by observers in Western Europe. But it is not only Brussilov who is attacked. "I must say that all the generals, particularly Alexiev, Ruzsky, and

* *The Prelude to Bolshevism: the Kornilov Rebellion.* By A. F. Kerensky, former Prime Minister of Russia. With two portraits. (T. Fisher Unwin. 16s. net.)

Denikin, evinced a complete lack of strategical and political insight. According to them the state of mind of the private soldiers lay at the root of the evil." The generals were certainly right, but it must be remembered that when M. Kerensky was giving his evidence he was engaged in defending his own *régime*, he was afraid of a counter-revolution, and by his own acknowledgment he had worked to secure his position. It is necessary, therefore, to take his evidence with reservations. It is merely a *prima facie* case, and may be rebutted. It certainly concludes nothing. Kornilov proved a disappointment, for if he was determined to abandon the offensive against Germany he was equally determined to begin an offensive against the Russian Provisional Government, and took a strong threatening line. According to M. Kerensky, a dictatorship was the goal of the Headquarters Staff, and Kornilov was put forward, willingly or unwillingly, as the dictator. It would seem that a strong organisation with financial backing was formed with this end in view, and on September 8th, 1917, a demand was made to M. Kerensky that he should resign in favour of Kornilov, and should go to Headquarters. "To gain time Kerensky promised Kornilov to come to his Headquarters, and at the same time took immediately all steps to cope with the rebellion at its very commencement." The conversation on the telephone between Kornilov and Kerensky gives some idea of the value of the evidence of M. Kerensky. No doubt he was fully justified in securing his position, but in the light of subsequent events it would seem that had he worked frankly with Kornilov instead of against him later disasters would have been avoided. However, Kornilov was successfully deceived and the rebellion crushed. But the effects of the rebellion, we are told, were unending. "An adventure of a small group was transformed in the inflamed imagination of the masses to a conspiracy of the whole of the *bourgeoisie*, and of all the upper classes against democracy and the working masses." We do not believe a word of it. It is true that the Bolsheviks began to secure control on September 20th, 1917, and spontaneous organisations sprang up in all directions on the pretext of fighting the counter-revolution. But history will not attribute this to the insurrection of General Kornilov. It was due to the weakness of the Provisional Government, and its incapacity to use its best servants, loyal servants of Russia, such as Kornilov and Brussilov. This *apologia* of the head of the Provisional Government is plausible and interesting, but it does not explain the emergence of Trotsky and Lenin, and the wave of chaos that spread over the Empire. The true explanation was lack of power to govern, and the Kornilov incident is, in fact, an example of the few cases where the Provisional Government attempted to govern and, in fact, destroyed the hope of law and order that lay in a temporary military dictatorship. Kornilov saw light in that direction, but was not a Napoleon. The Provisional Government saw light in no direction, and was swallowed by the night of Bolshevism.

PLOTINUS AND MYSTICISM.*

The Dean of St. Paul's did well in choosing the philosophy of Plotinus as the subject of his Gifford lectures. The subject of Mysticism is very much in the public mind now, "the pursuit," to use Dr. Inge's phrase, "of ultimate, objective truth." In one sense it may be said that "this philosophy runs counter to a very strong current in contemporary thought." But in any age that thinks seriously there is always a marked dualism of thought, and though we deprecate the popular subjectivism which "has broken down the barriers which divide fact from fancy, knowledge from superstition," yet at the same time there is behind this popular foolishness, which was as well known in Alexandria in Neo-Platonic days as it is in London to-day, a certain craving for reality which reflects much substantial investigation into phenomena and some sound notions as to reality. But by all means let us have the philosophy of mysticism, though mysticism is a frame of being that is not dependent on philosophy for its force. Dr. Inge says that "Mysticism is a spiritual philosophy which demands the concurrent activity of thought, will, and feeling." We doubt if it is a philosophy at all, though the thinkers, from Plato to Plotinus and from Plotinus through the long line of Western mystics or semi-mystics who found their spiritual goal in the balanced mind of Thomas à Kempis, show that the mystic life is susceptible of a philosophic explanation. St. Bernard claimed to have seen God. He was the mystic pure and simple, and his mysticism was not philosophy, but fact in action. The Neo-Platonism which found its crown in Plotinus has a great place in the history of philosophy as well as in the history of Christianity, and Dr. Inge is very naturally displeased with Professor Harnach and other German explorers into the history of Christianity for failing to appreciate the superb value of the Greek contribution to Christianity. Platonism is not popular with the German mind, and German scholars shut or try to shut their eyes to elements that they do not desire to understand. They fit the facts, in religion and philosophy as well as in history and science, to the theory. The Catholic revolt against Platonism is less easy to understand, since the religious philosophy of the Middle Ages was predominantly Neo-Platonic, while the practical mind of à Kempis gave the same note to applied theology. It is perhaps significant that à Kempis is not a saint of the Roman Catholic Church. This honour has been withheld for reasons that seem impossible to explain, for few personalities have done more to promote the faith of the Church in the sphere of conduct and in the grasp of the ultimate realities which are the goal of the mystic and the would-be goal of the every-day Christian. Thus we see a strong field against applied Platonism to-day: the Church of Rome, the German Protestants, the popular religious materialists in many lands. Therefore it is wise to go back to Plotinus, though we cannot agree that thinkers have neglected him to the extent

* *The Philosophy of Plotinus: the Gifford Lectures at St. Andrews, 1917-18.* By William Ralph Inge, C.V.O., D.D., Dean of St. Paul's. In two volumes. (Longmans. 28s. net.)

alleged by Dr. Inge: At any rate, at Oxford Dr. Caird made much of him, and all admirers of that keen thinker and very learned historian of philosophy will recall the place that Dr. Caird gave him. Dr. Inge regards Dr. Caird as "one of the master minds of his generation." But he quarrels with him on the subject of Plotinus. We venture to think that the Oxford philosopher was right when, "in criticising Plotinus, he assumes that because in the material world no movement can take place without loss of energy on the part of the mover, the same law must hold in the spiritual world." We not only think that this doctrine is right, but that it is essential. It explains why on physical death the soul or spirit of man cannot dissipate. That soul is a fund of spiritual energy to which the doctrine of the conservation of energy applies. This doctrine involves accretion and decrease of power, but makes certain that there can be no such thing as the destruction of spiritual energy. Is it clear that Plotinus, who "teaches that there was never a time when the Universal Soul was not present in the universe," did not really hold the doctrine himself?

"What is most real in the world is that which reflects the purpose, meaning and plan which called it into being. By fixing our attention on this, we are taking the only path by which anything in heaven or earth can be understood, that is to say, by viewing it in its relation to what is next above it. So the broken lights of the Divine which irradiate this world of ours will flow together; and in rising above the flux of changing phenomena we shall leave nothing behind. Suns, stars, and all that is good and beautiful 'here below' exist also 'yonder.' All things on earth were in heaven; 'for whence else could they have come?' 'Spirit is the first lawgiver, or rather the law of all-being.'"

This view of Plotinus set forth by Dr. Inge on page 199 we think implies that the laws of material things, such as the doctrine of the Conservation of Energy, have universal operation. In so far as Plotinus fails to apply this criterion he is open to criticism.

Dr. Inge points out that Plotinus "is the one great genius in an age singularly barren of greatness," the third century, an age of decline and pessimism when many changes in imperial life placed "the traditions and civilisation of Rome" within the care of aliens. But in religion and psychology there was progress.

"The so-called Alexandrian philosophy of religion was a great achievement of still unexhausted richness. . . The three protagonists were Plotinus, Origen and the successors of Valentinus; representing respectively Greek philosophy, Hellenised Christianity, and Hellenised Orientalism. . . . Greek Christian theology, and the Augustinian theology, were alike the heirs of the first two."

Thus, as Dr. Inge shows, the third century was very fruitful for us in matters of religion and thought. He traces the forerunners of Plotinus and shows us the great teacher at work in Rome, and in constant communication with Athens and other centres of thought. He was born in A.D. 204 or 205, perhaps at Lycopolis, in Egypt. There he had his first training, and thence he passed to Alexandria, and eventually, at the age of 28, became for ten years the disciple

of Ammonius Saccas. Plotinus accompanied the expedition of the Emperor Gordius against Sapor, King of Persia; and from Mesopotamia, where Gordius was assassinated, made his way with difficulty to Antioch, and thence in 244 A.D. to Rome, where he founded a school and was favoured by the Emperor Gallienus and his wife Salonina. In 250 A.D. he began to write, and the MSS. of his lectures, in a terrible state, were edited by his disciple Porphyry. The *Enneads* of Plotinus are not models, by any means, of style. The difficulties and obscurities of the text have done much to hide his thought from the world. The philosopher died in the Campagna, and his death reflected the equanimity of his life. We are told that his face was as beautiful as his character. His philosophy was reflected in his life, for he had striven to found an ideal city in the swamps of the Campagna, and in his death he felt that he was passing to union with God. Plotinus, we are told, was not "vitally interested in the question of the individual survival in time or in that of rewards and punishments." "The true life of the soul is," says Dr. Inge, "not in time at all." Plotinus purports to give us a timeless philosophy, the philosophy of a being who passes through time and does not recur in time. The Hegelians, and indeed the Cairdians and Dr. McTaggart himself, do not like this view, and say, "How could the individual develop in time, if an ultimate element of the nature was destined not to recur in time?" Dr. Inge's answer is, "What ground have we for supposing that the destiny of the individual is to 'develop in time' beyond the span of a single life? It is a pure assumption, like the unscientific belief in the perpetual progress of the race, so popular in the last century." These are the kind of difficulties that arise in considering the thought of Plotinus. That such problems are stimulating in the intellectual sense is clear. Whether they greatly help Christianity we may venture to doubt. If one must be placed in the dilemma of reincarnation with Dr. McTaggart or absorption in reality with Dr. Inge, the former seems a brighter destiny. But fortunately Christianity offers a resolution of the dilemma, and perhaps it is worth while to remember that neither Plotinus nor Hegel was a Christian.

J. E. G. DE M.

* * *

BISMARCK AND WILLIAM II.*

At an age when most writers have laid aside their pen, Sir Adolphus Ward commenced a history of Germany in the nineteenth century, and at fourscore years he has completed his arduous task. The third volume exhibits no more sign of declining power than its predecessors. No other British scholar could have produced a work combining such profound erudition with such flawless impartiality; and historical students throughout the world will feel gratitude to

* Germany, 1815-1890. By Sir Adolphus Ward. Vol. 3. 1871-1890. With two Supplementary Chapters. (Cambridge University Press. 1918.)

the veteran author of the first adequate narrative in our language of the fortunes of Germany from Waterloo to our own time.

The latest instalment opens with the Peace of Frankfurt and surveys the last twenty years of Bismarck's dictatorship. A long chapter is devoted to "The Conflict with Rome," commonly known as the *Kulturkampf*, in which the personality of Windthorst stands out prominently, and which corrects the common impression that Bismarck ended by "going to Canossa" after all. In tracing the evolution of the other parties he paints vivid portraits of the leaders—of Bennigsen, the veteran National Liberal; Lasker, the brilliant Jew; Richter, the mordant radical individualist; Delbrück, the Chancellor's right-hand man in home affairs till the adoption of Protection; Miquel, the ex-revolutionary of 1848. The most interesting feature in the sketch of foreign policy is the discussion of the war scare of 1875, in regard to which Sir Adolphus refuses to accept Bismarck's protestations of innocence. While recognising to the full the Iron Chancellor's almost superhuman genius he is never carried away by the glamour of his achievement; and the treatment of Arnim and Caprivi, to take two notable examples, moves him to stern condemnation of a man "devoid of magnanimity in his dealings with other men, and especially those in any sense in rivalry with himself."

The two supplementary chapters on the reign of William II. continue the survey in somewhat more summary fashion to the year 1907, when "a period begins that must be regarded as preliminary to the World War." Into this discussion the historian refuses to enter, since the embers are still too hot under his feet. But within the limits he has set himself he moves with unfaltering tread, casting a rapid though searching glance at the character and policy of the Emperor and his Chancellors, the development of the colonial empire, the creation of a fleet, the tangled thread of German relations with the Great Powers of both hemispheres, and the ominous growth of international ill-will. "At the root of this ill-will lay the manifest and declared determination of German statesmanship to assert, whenever an opportunity occurred and on whatever scale German interests might be involved, the claim of Germany to a leading share in shaping the future of all parts of the world." Since Germany was not the only State which was ready to wage war for the realisation of its ambitions, whatever the cost, the peace of the world hung upon a thread; and it is rather a matter for astonishment that the great conflagration was so long delayed than that it came in 1914.

The present volume is enriched by a chapter of 125 pages devoted to "Social and Intellectual Life, 1850-1900." The field is so vast and the labourers are so numerous that many a scholar, artist, and thinker has to be dismissed in a paragraph or a line. But the Master of Peterhouse has provided a panorama in which the laws of perspective are faithfully observed, and which conveys to the reader a graphic impression both of the quantity and quality of the achievement of nineteenth-century Germany in the wide domains of culture.

G. P. G.

A GERMAN LEAGUE OF NATIONS.*

It will be with interest not altogether unmixed with amused reflections that the allied countries will read the book by Herr Mathias Erzberger, the leader of the Centre Party in the Reichstag. We are told that the book was passed by the German Censor in September, 1918, and if this is so the work is, of course, camouflage, for to deceive by words was one of the chief German weapons at that date. The book is, however, an amazing production, and might deceive the very elect if its readers were not aware of the German record during the war, and of the conspiracy which preceded the war to secure the hegemony of the world. Herr Erzberger writes in a happy moral vein, with a wonderful assumption of the nobility of the entire German outlook. He blesses good English Liberals and the good and peaceful Papacy; he advises us all for our good, and writes with such a detachment from mundane considerations as might besit a minister of religion. The book, however, is from end to end a piece of mischievous and dangerous camouflage, issued at the moment when the High Command realised that the end was in sight, and that if victory was to be won at all it must be won at the Peace Conference by dividing the Allies there, and securing such provisions as would enable Germany, with her manufactories and works uninjured, to complete the economic ruin of France, whose economic machinery had been wrecked by the German soldiery.

The book is, on the whole, like so many German devices, too clever by half. It could not deceive anyone except those who wish to be deceived. The oily praise given to Mr. Wilson, who is "pursuing a purely American policy," whose "idea of a League of Nations is opposed to that of England," will not deceive American statesmen. The attempt, repeatedly and boldly made, to make bad blood between England and America merely shows that Germany is impenitent. Mr. Wilson is "England's peremptory partner." "In respect to England . . . Wilson is inclined to assume the manner of a conqueror." On the other hand, England, as represented by Lord Robert Cecil, wishes to isolate Germany, and the English Government wishes to set up a League of Nations "under the overlordship of England." All this is curiously inconsistent. On the one hand England is the vassal of America, on the other she is expecting to be the lord of the world. This attempt to make bad blood, this effort to show England and France as really conflicting with the high moral ideas of the sometime "idiotic Yankees," would be ludicrous if it were not so obviously designed. There is no doubt that Germany hopes to break up the Entente powers, but our leaders, at any rate, are quite aware of their designs.

Germany wants her colonies back, and there is a most plaintive plea for them. Why should she have them back? Because, says Herr Erzberger, the German is the ideal colonist. On page 242 we read a pathetic account of German colonial efforts. Those who know the utter devilry of the Germans in their relations with

* *The League of Nations: The Way to the World's Peace.* By M. Erzberger. Translated by Bernard Miall. (Hodder & Stoughton. 7s. 6d. net.)

native races will read with something like a sense of moral repulsion the statement that "the German Government, since Dernburg's accession to office, have regarded the chief wealth of the colonies as residing in their inhabitants, and have therefore taken all possible pains to develop them in every respect." But this is only one example of the sheer hypocrisy of motive that runs through every line of the book. It is a bold bid to defeat the Allies after the war, and the impudent suggestions contained in "The Draft Constitution" for a League of Nations could only proceed from a German who has emerged defeated from a war in which his nation has been guilty of every conceivable crime. No other person could have had the effrontery to write such a book and to make proposals which, if carried into effect, would give the Germans the full fruits of victory. The book should be studied as a special example of German psychology, and should be added to the curiosities of literature.



SHORTER REVIEWS.

Dr. Charles Mercier in "Crime and Criminals" (University of London Press, 10s. 6d. net) deals with "the jurisprudence of crime, medical, biological, and psychological." Sir Bryan Donkin, in his introduction, states his conviction that the work "is pre-eminently sound in its principles, and valuable in its application to practice."

Dr. Mercier shows clearly that the part of Jurisprudence, in this relationship, is to regard criminal action not merely as it is deemed such in law, but rather as it ought to be deemed in the light of scientific study. . . . The doctrine that the turpitude of a criminal differs widely from that of the crime deserves very special attention. The turpitude of the criminal is to be judged by the intention with which he performs an act. If he intends and tries to murder a man, and does not succeed, he should be hanged; and if he intends to kill a dog and by mistake kills a man, he should be punished only for killing the dog." To a lawyer this would seem a very dangerous doctrine if pushed to such excesses, for the simple reason that in order to secure the absolute criminality that Dr. Mercier rightly desires to punish it is necessary to go into something deeper than "intention" as lawyers understand that term, since, as a fifteenth century judge once said: "The devil himself knoweth not the mind of man." In fact, the law of England does as far as possible seek to find the guilty mind, the *mens rea*, and in most crimes it is necessary to establish actual wicked intention. Sir Bryan Donkin deals with a very rare exception, the case of "constructive murder," where a person in the course of a felonious act kills another. It may seem an absurd rule, but it is of great practical use. If A burns down a haystack in order to spite a farmer, and in doing so burns to death a tramp sleeping on the stack, the deed is murder, and rightly so, for the mind of A is essentially "wicked," and is prepared to sacrifice anyone or anything to secure his revenge. But according to Dr. Mercier's doctrine the man would be tried for the offence of burning the stack, which was what he intended, and not for the burning of the man, of whose existence he was unaware. It is, as Dr. Mercier rightly says, "necessary for the preservation and for the

very existence of society, that action injurious to society should be suppressed," and it is for this reason that a doctrine of "constructive" intention is necessary. But, of course, it is quite true that Dr. Mercier's definition of crime as consisting of "acts that are injurious to society" includes, and rightly includes, many acts which are not punishable by the common law, which indeed excludes many offences, such as immorality, which were and are offences under ecclesiastical law. But the question of what acts should be punishable and what should not is a very difficult one, because the question of expediency comes in. It is not always expedient in the best interests of society to punish offenders whose acts are undoubtedly injurious to society, since the punishment may be still more injurious to society. Dr. Mercier, in his classification, divides crimes into national and international offences. We do not agree that the latter are "few in number," and should like to add to the brief list given in the book the white slave traffic, attacks on the elaborate international machinery of intercourse, offences in relation to contracts between persons of different nationality, and all war crimes. National offences Dr. Mercier divides into public and private crimes, the first being against the elaborate machinery of the State, and the second springing from motives of self-advantage or sexual instinct. Dr. Mercier's book will be studied with sympathy both by lawyers and sociologists, since certainly his analysis and classification of crimes lie along the lines of common sense, which on the whole are the lines of the common law, and are not weakened by adherence to the absurd theorising of Lombroso and other sociologists of that type.

* * *

Mr. Ernest Rhys in this "Book of Verses Inspired by Visits to Camps in France and at Home" entitled "The Leaf Burners" (J. M. Dent & Sons, Ltd., 4s. 6d. net) has given us some commemorative poems that will rank high among the poetry of the war. The lines "to a lady who lost her son in the war" are good indeed and of real help, for they make us see the immortal part of the men

"Who had upon their grimy brows the bright
Gleam of the warless days of liberty."

Many will turn to "The Ballad of the Homing Man" and feel the beat and thrill of the living music:

" 'Three voices in a doorway,' he says, a woman's form,
And a lighted hearth behind her, can make a desert warm.
And what is Heaven but a house, like any other one,
Where the homing man finds harbour, and the hundred roads are done? "

"Vingt-Sept" is another ballad, a ballad of Alsatian heroes, that few would like to miss, while "Verdun" has a note in it that strikes the very deeps:—

"The dead called to the quick, that night,
Between Seine water and the Somme;
The soldiers of Napoleon
Joined in the march below *Mort Homme*."

Of the poem "Italy," written when the fate of Venice lay in the balance, the critic can only say that it is worthy of a great occasion and of the inspiration that springs from Dante:—

"Now, if she calls from Grappa's gate,
While past Piave strides the Murderer,
His Austrian hound at heel—be not too late."

The poem recalls the hatred that the Brownings had of the Austrians and their joint love for their faithful and immortal Italy. The twenty poems entitled the "Tommead" are, of course, the heart of the book, and are transcripts from life. In all his phases we see our dear English Tommy who has saved his Motherland, and to whom and our sailormen we owe salvation from the fate of Belgium and Northern France. Mr. Rhys sees the spiritual side of these men. From them "something looks out Aquinas would have prized." It is true. And great heroes sprang from every possible source of English life, from the counter, the plough, the mean street, the castle. Throughout this really memorable book it is impossible to mistake the mystic note which Herbert and Blake, reviving pre-Reformation literary traditions, gave to English poetry. Blake went for his mysticism to bare reality, where in fact it resides. Mr. Rhys has done the same, and in doing so has renewed a great note in English poetry.

* * *

The Bishop of Oxford, in the volume entitled "The League of Nations: The Opportunity of the Church" (Hodder & Stoughton, 1s. net) which in its original form was written at the request of the British Ministry of Information, insists that "The Christian Church, in all its parts and members, should welcome the project and organise itself into vigorous unanimity to press it to the front in the attention of all civilised peoples. It is both a practical proposal made to us by our most trusted statesmen, and it is a proposal profoundly congenial to the Christian spirit." We are required, Dr. Gore tells us, "to value our nation as an instrument for ends that are wider than our nation." This, we believe, the best Englishmen have always done, and it is through this that our political and social ideas have passed across the earth. If this spirit survives to-day, as we are sure that it does, we shall play a leading part in securing the "co-ordinated action in all Christian countries" for which Dr. Gore asks. The difficulties which are feared are probably exaggerated. The Bishop of Oxford feels "that any proposal, however moderate, to limit by international or super-national control the judgment of a nation about what its own honour and interests require, will excite against it a very deep and widespread passion of national pride." The course of the Peace Conference shows that this is too great a fear. The war has made men better nationalists, but also better internationalists. We know each other as never before, and a new unity of the world is in sight. The Bishop looks "with a profound hope to the Christian Church." So do we, despite that absence of spiritual union which the moderate party in the Church of England deplores daily. The Bishop looks for a union of all parties in the League of Nations movement. So do we, but a League of Denominations will fail unless the spirit which was quelled at Kikuyu remains banished. On this point also we are hopeful.

* * *

Readers of Lord Morley's classical biography will welcome the valuable supplement to our knowledge of Cobden's activities and opinions provided in "Richard Cobden, the International Man" (Fisher Unwin, 21s. net). The volume mainly consists of letters to Henry Richard, Secretary of the Peace Society, leader-writer on the *Morning Star*, and, after his friend's death, Member of Parliament for twenty years. Other new material, including some valuable letters to

the American statesman Charles Sumner, and to French publicists, is employed to complete the picture; and Mr. Hobson has done his editorial work with skill and sympathy, collecting, arranging, explaining. Cobden's work for Free Trade was dealt with in sufficient detail by Lord Morley, and little is added to the story in these pages except in the chapter on the French Treaty of 1860; but the volume throws a flood of light on his attitude towards the theory and practice of foreign affairs for the last fifteen years of his life. It was a prolonged duel between Palmerston and Cobden, in which the latter was usually worsted; for though Gladstone gave him valuable help in the French Treaty, they differed on the American Civil War, and there was never any real intimacy between the two men. The title of "the international man" was conferred on him by the great journalist Emile de Girardin, and this interesting volume proves its justice. Cobden applied the same principles in judging the policy of his own and other countries, and tested every action by its effect on the peace and orderly progress of the world. To politicians of the Palmerstonian or Imperialist school many of the letters will seem self-righteous and censorious. To Liberals and champions of what we now know as "Wilsonian" ideas they will appear for the most part as far-sighted as they are courageous. If we achieve a League of Nations, accompanied by arbitration, disarmament and economic freedom, Cobden will be regarded as one of the first and greatest of its prophets. We have got past "non-intervention," just as we left behind a *laissez-faire* labour policy; but, as Mr. Hobson points out in his luminous closing chapter, non-intervention was sound and defensible because genuine internationalism was at that time impossible.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

In "The Training of Youth: A Treatise on the Training of Adolescents" (T. Fisher Unwin, 7s. net) Mr. T. W. Berry, the director of education at Rhondda, has given us a series of practical essays on outdoor and indoor recreations, play-centres, juvenile employment, vocational training, as well as papers on the general principles underlying adolescent education, and on the moral and technical problems involved. The book is from the pen of an enthusiastic specialist, and at this time when continuation education is in all minds the essays should be closely and widely studied.

* * *

In "The Idea of Public Right" (George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 8s. 6d. net) there are gathered together the first four essays in each of the three divisions on "The Nation" essay competition, of which the result was published in August, 1917. "The majority of the writers [of the essays submitted] have accepted the necessity of the war under the particular circumstances in which Europe in general, and this country in particular, were placed in 1914. Some have accepted it with ardour, others with reluctance. A minority have adopted the pacifist attitude and have treated the war as equally wrong for both sides." All the writers repudiate (the judges further report) any economic boycott if future harmonious relations are to be secured. The pacifist writers repudiate force in connection with a League of Nations. The essays in Division III. are by working men and women, and the judges consider that these

attain a high standard, and are perhaps distinguished "by the tendency to a too easy acceptance of ideals." Mr. Asquith, in his brief introduction, considers that the "publication of these essays" at this time ought to be of real service in clearing both the atmosphere and the ground. The "enthronement of public right" (in Mr. Gladstone's phrase) would not only justify but repay the incalculable losses, personal and national, of the War. It can only be reached by careful thinking, by patient exploration, and by persistent and concerted effort." The first prize of 100 guineas for an essay on "The Idea of Public Right," open to men and women resident in Great Britain and Ireland, was shared between Mr. Emile Burns and Dr. Hugh H. L. Bellot, with whose essays the volume opens.

* * *

Mr. Edward Garnett in "Papa's War and Other Satires" (George Allen & Unwin, Ltd.) proves at any rate two things, that he is not a modern Swift, and that he has not a judicial mind. It is difficult to see the real purpose of this attack on War if that is all the book is intended for, since everyone admits that War is an evil, and only tolerable when it is used to overcome a greater evil, such, for instance, as the threat to destroy human freedom made when Germany launched her infamous attack on Belgium and France. We all want to see the end of wars, but not at the cost of freedom. Mr. Garnett, however, does not realise that he is preaching to a converted world. But apparently he thinks that we should have secured an inconclusive peace if the following quotation is to be taken as representing the author's mind: "'Well,' asked Twatsi, 'the Allies might have stopped it more than a year ago, twice, when the Germans offered peace. But you English were so proud of your army, and you and your Allies' War-aims were so, so——! And Fate was stronger than I.' That saying is true, 'Against Stupidity even the gods fight in vain.''" But at any rate the peoples who fought this war to an end and destroyed Germany are not so stupid as this verbose, dull, but mischievous book.

* * *

Switzerland has played a unique part in the war having the problem ever in view of its German and its French populations and the conflicting sympathies of various cantons. And it has played its part with credit and dignity and maintained great historical traditions with bravery as well as honesty. Hence Mr. C. F. Cameron's volume in "The Nations' Histories" Series on "Switzerland" (T. C. & E. C. Jack, 5s. net) will be read with profit as well as interest at the present time. It carries us down from the earliest prehistoric through the Roman Age to the periods of Charlemagne, of William Tell (whose name is not recorded till 1470, more than a century and a half after the events which he is supposed to have adorned), of the beginnings of the Confederacy in the fourteenth century, of the periods of the Reformation, the Revolution into, at last, the days of the Constitution of 1874. Many charming illustrations add something to a sober, straight-forward and very attractive narrative. Students of ecclesiastical history will turn with pleasure to the chapters that tell of the part that Zürich, Vaud, Geneva, Berne, played in the Reformation.

* * *

Mr. Oswald Stoll in the Introduction to "Freedom in Finance" (T. Fisher Unwin, 10s. 6d. net) declares that "the latest method—Control of Banking Credit, *alias* Funds, *alias* Money—whereby a monopoly of

the trade of the world is to follow the world war, is the most ambitious as well as the most subtle attempt ever made to control the means to live. Should it succeed, then economic slavery would betide the bulk of the population on the European and American continents, besides farther afield, until its overthrow. . . . Reasoned freedom to participate as a right in the control of credit, *alias* funds, *alias* money, which is fundamental to successful industry, trade and commerce, is the claim which this book makes for the British people." So Mr. Stoll gives us from the pen of an "eminent Parliamentary draftsman" the first draft of "a Bill to provide for the granting of Industrial Loans by Banks on property used for the purposes of Production, to provide for a Government guarantee in respect of such loans, to extend the powers and duties of the Bank of England, and otherwise to facilitate the creation of credit within the British Empire." The book will be read with interest by those who are in favour of agricultural and commercial stimulus by means of State organised credit for the individual worker.

* * *

Mr. P. E. Matheson, in his preface to "Holy Russia and other poems translated from the Russian" (Humphrey Milford: Oxford University Press, 3s. net), says truly that "anything . . . which may help in the smallest degree to make Russian life and ideas better known in England seems worth attempting. . . . The future of Eastern Europe and of Asia must depend very largely on the question whether the Russian people, reorganised in its national life, shall stand by the side of France, Italy, England, and America to guarantee the free life of the future by an invincible League of Nations." Certainly this is true, but Bolshevism must be overthrown and the murderers dealt with before the heart of the new Russia can be revealed. Meantime, it is well to turn to the Russian poets, such as Lermontov, of the age of struggle, and see how the soul of Russia beats against the bars. Mr. Matheson has a dainty touch, an excellent trick of verse, which makes English poetry out of Russian. Thus:—

"Though Winter fume for ever,
And Spring the invader scold,
Spring only grows more noisy.
Her laughter still more bold"—

gives us an echo of Swinburne. There is something of the Greek epigram in certain of these poems, and indeed the tradition may have come down from Byzantium by way of the Greek Church.

* * *

In "Uncensored Celebrities" (T. Fisher Unwin, Ltd., 10s. 6d. net) Mr. E. T. Raymond gives us some brightly written accounts of men famous, or somewhat famous, in the political and journalistic world of to-day. He writes, of course, of the leading politicians, and criticises what may be called perhaps the Tory or "illiberal" section, but he declares that Sir Edward Carson has "undoubted courage," recognises the high qualities of Lord Robert Cecil, and realises that Mr. Balfour is "the finest intellectual weapon in our armoury." The book, which has many brilliant qualities, is too personal—but some readers will like that quality—and sometimes spiteful. The essay on the present Lord Chancellor is not fair play. Lord Birkenhead is a good lawyer, despite all suggestions to the contrary, and an excellent international lawyer.

OWING to the increased cost of paper and printing the Editors are reluctantly compelled to raise the price of "The Contemporary Review" to 3/- per copy. To ensure copies readers are requested to place their orders beforehand with a bookseller or newsagent.

THE INDUSTRIAL UNREST: A NEW POLICY REQUIRED.

THE Industrial Unrest, which to-day is the most pressing and complex domestic concern of the Government and the nation, is no phenomenon arising out of the war or the conditions created by the war; but a permanent feature of our present industrial system, which fluctuates in intensity and gravity according to changing industrial and political conditions. It is the result of an ever-present insurgent spirit, which has been described as the "spirit of divine discontent," and which is in essence a moral struggle to attain to that complete development and fullness of human life which is the right of all, but the actual attainment of few.

It is a mistaken conception to regard industrial unrest as concerned solely with material or economic ends: a struggle for selfish economic advantages and improvements for their own sake: a national sore which can be totally eliminated or remedied by the periodical grant of an increase of wages, reduction of hours, improvement of working conditions. It is quite true that in the past this spirit has been temporarily alleviated or quietened by such concessions, and the workers diverted by palliatives from their ultimate purpose of securing radical changes in the industrial system; but always in the long run the result has been an inevitable resumption of the struggle. The idea that Labour is "out only for what it can get" is a false understanding of the deeper meaning of industrial unrest, which has in the past been both short-sighted and dangerous, and which, if indulged in the more difficult conditions of the present, may lead to national disaster.

The workers of all lands are profoundly dissatisfied with their lot: they are in moral antagonism to the circumstances and conditions which limit and circumscribe their physical, mental, and spiritual development. No longer content to remain a raw product, a mere cog in a dividend-producing and unsympathetic machine of industry, the worker aspires to become a finished article—a cultured, clean-living, contented being. Neither to live in order to produce, nor to produce in order to live, is a just and ideal conception of the function of the human individual. The worker's sense of values, his outlook on life, and his recognition of the power concentrated in the hands of the organised producers of and contributors to national wealth, have been radically changed as a result of the stress and strain of the war. Having fought and worked against political

oppression abroad, he is now determined to reject an equally unacceptable economic and industrial oppression at home. International freedom and security are valueless to him, without their counterparts of personal freedom and industrial security.

Prior to the outbreak of the war, industrial unrest was a very serious factor in national life, and threatened to involve the country in a grave crisis. Indeed, I do not think it is an exaggeration to say that only the peril of war in which the country was involved, sufficed to postpone the danger which then confronted us. During the period of world conflict Labour, though it manifested a disposition to avoid industrial dislocations and stoppages, chafed under its grievances. The pressure of imperative war industry, with its inevitable or avoidable restrictions, hardships, and disappointments, together with vexatious administrative delays and blunders, which in less serious national circumstances might of themselves have caused a general conflagration, aggravated the spirit of discontent to such an extent that observers closely connected with Labour realised that immediately the restraints imposed by the common concern for national interest and national welfare were removed by the conclusion of hostilities, the floodgates of industrial revolt would be flung open. Only a real spirit of forbearance on the part of the workers generally, and a true recognition of the primary needs of the commonweal in circumstances of war, saved the nation from industrial dislocations which would have been disastrous in their consequences.

Even so, in certain localities the feeling created by real or imaginary grievances became so acute that not even the fact that the nation was engaged in a life-or-death struggle was sufficient to deter the men from making immediate spasmodic manifestations in order to demonstrate to the public the unjust impositions to which they were being subjected by unscrupulous profiteers, who were taking advantage of the nation's preoccupation in the prosecution of the war to amass large fortunes at the expense of the toilers. It is not difficult to understand the resentment aroused by such selfish action when it is borne in mind that the workmen, fully sensible to the national danger, had voluntarily agreed to the suspension of many of their hardly won workshop customs, practices and rights, in order that the nation might the more rapidly, easily and effectually be organised for victory. This was no empty or worthless sacrifice, but one of real and substantial value, for it entailed severe restrictions, hardships, and concessions, which in peace conditions Labour would not willingly have accepted; and as a result Labour was shorn of much of its strength in its dealing with organised capital. The Government had given a pledge that at the end of the war these suspended customs would be completely restored; but a feeling spread abroad that the employers intended to do all in their power to render the redemption of this pledge difficult if not impossible. Moreover, the workers lost confidence in the Government, who were regarded as lukewarm in their attitude toward the restoration of trade union customs. In addition to these causes of unrest, there were social and political factors which contributed in greater or less measure to an aggravation of the

unsettlement, especially the high cost of living, the administration of the Military Service Acts and the Munitions of War Acts, the lack of housing accommodation in large industrial centres, and physical fatigue due to long working hours, Sunday labour, and the absence of holidays. The result of these primary and contributory causes of industrial unrest was the dangerous state of affairs which existed in 1917, and which caused the Prime Minister in July to appoint a Commission "to enquire into and report upon Industrial Unrest, and to make recommendations to the Government at the earliest practicable date."

In circles which are usually hostile to Labour the workers had been accused of a lack of patriotism, of a desire to obtain selfish advantages without regard to the national interest; of attempting to use the national danger in order to extort increases of wages. It was commonly stated that never had Labour been so highly remunerated; never were wages so good. What were the findings of the Commission? The Commission for the North East area stated: "It is no doubt true that in some industries wages have risen to such an extent as largely to compensate for the increased cost of living, but there are workers whose wages have been raised very slightly, if at all, and some whose earnings have actually diminished, and on those the high food prices have borne heavily. Joined to the actual sense of hardship there is undoubtedly a deep-seated conviction in the minds of the working classes that the prices of food have risen, not only through scarcity, but as the result of manipulation of prices by unscrupulous producers and traders, who, it is alleged, owing to the lack of courageous action on the part of the Government, have succeeded in making fabulous profits at the expense of the consumers" (who are largely workers). The subsequent action of the Government in the matter of the control and regulation of food supplies and food distribution was an official admission of the justice of the workers' grievance, which might not have been even partially remedied had not the workers, by means of industrial unrest, compelled the Government to cease their policy of immobility and indifference.

The measures taken by the Government, acting on the recommendations of the Commission of Enquiry, served to allay for the time being the feeling of unrest which had become so pronounced throughout the country, but they did not eradicate that unrest from industry. They served the immediate purposes of the Government, in so far as they secured a sufficient measure of industrial harmony to enable the war to be prosecuted to victory. But beneath the apparently smooth and untroubled surface lay a controlled and restrained discontent.

Such was the state of affairs among the workmen at the signing of the Armistice, which was followed by the demobilisation of workers who had been for a while soldiers on military service and war workers at home, and the general cessation of industrial war activities. Much depended on the plans of the Government to meet demobilisation, both military and industrial, social reconstruction and industrial reorganisation, and before many weeks had passed it became apparent that the Government provisions were seriously

inadequate to meet the pressing needs of the occasion. Demobilisation blunders both in the Army and among the war workers at home followed in rapid succession, and a dangerous situation soon developed into the present industrial crisis. The workers became more determined than ever to effect urgent improvements and changes, and in some cases preparations were made to achieve these ends by means of national strikes, if it were found to be impossible to secure them by pacific means.

It may not be out of place to make a brief reference to the unfortunate electoral methods of the Coalition and their inevitable results at the recent General Election, having regard to their effect on the present serious industrial situation. The Prime Minister, in his anxiety to maintain and consolidate his position and to prevent the return of a strong Labour Party to Parliament, attacked its candidates by political misrepresentation which largely contributed to the result that instead of securing the return of 140 members to which its total vote entitled it, the Party rose from thirty-six members only to sixty-two members. At a time of such impending labour troubles, when the importance of political action, as against direct action or the policy of striking, to ventilate economic grievances and to effect industrial changes, could hardly be over-emphasised, the Party candidates were deliberately accused of being representatives of the most destructive and unconstitutional element in either politics or industry. And to-day a large number of the election "Bolshevists" are among those people to whom the Prime Minister has appealed to promote and strengthen the spirit of conciliation and reason which is vital to a pacific settlement of the industrial problem. The under-representation of Labour in Parliament may safely be recorded as a chief political factor contributing to the industrial trouble.

To-day we are faced with the existence of unrest more widespread and deep-seated than ever before in the history of industrial England. In every branch of industry, in every part of the country, we are on the verge of industrial revolt. That a new policy is needed must be obvious. During the war the workers were assured on numerous occasions, both by representatives of the Government and by leading employers of labour, that a return to the unsatisfactory pre-war conditions was unthinkable: and they were led to expect with the return of peace a higher standard of life, more agreeable working conditions, and a larger place in industry. The plea was made generally for industrial harmony and friendly co-operation between Capital and Labour, in order to permit of industrial readjustments by peaceful means rather than by strife. So far there is little evidence that either the Government or the employers have formulated any definite comprehensive policy, and Labour feels the desire is to subject it to further long-suffering and inaction.

There is a growing demand for the nationalisation of vital industries and public services, and for the retention and extension of control of essential industries and services that cannot be nationalised immediately. Side by side with this is an increasing demand for the workers themselves to take a larger share in the

control of industry. They are determined to resist efforts aiming at the establishment of monopolies, and to secure a more equitable apportionment of the results of industry. The proposals of the Whitley Committee are a partial recognition, but they do not satisfy the claim to an equal and democratic partnership in industry.

The claim of the workers to a higher standard of life and leisure finds expression in the almost universal demand for a substantial reduction in working hours. This reduction is undoubtedly necessary in the interests of the health and efficiency of the workmen. Experience during the war of long working hours, overtime and Sunday work, and the general curtailment of holidays, showed that the efficiency of the worker was reduced and his health impaired. This question of reduction of hours is perhaps the most general cause of the present unrest.

Other immediate and special causes are to be found in high food prices, wages, war profiteering, unemployment, present and prospective, inadequacy of housing accommodation, unsatisfactory and unhealthy social conditions, non-recognition of certain trade unions, lack of confidence in existing machinery for dealing with industrial differences, largely due to administrative delays during the war, and numerous minor grievances which if not promptly dealt with and redressed might assume large proportions and take a prominent place in contributing to and encouraging unrest in the future.

It is difficult to estimate the far-reaching effects of the unrest if it be allowed to continue and develop so as to become no longer controllable by the workers' accredited leaders. For the chief danger lies not in industrial unrest which is definitely organised and controlled and wisely guided and directed by recognised leaders, but in unconstitutional action manifesting itself in sporadic local efforts and without any fixed purpose or definite policy. It is the difference between recognised trade union action and industrial anarchy. Industrial unrest to-day is real and serious, and does not admit of either burking or delay or insincerity. It calls for clear and comprehensive remedies, not for clever expedients or temporary palliatives.

In considering causes from the standpoint of remedies, they may roughly be divided into two categories: (1) temporary or local causes which arise from the operation of the existing industrial system and can be settled by immediate treatment within the general framework of the system; and (2) basic causes whose solution is only to be found in a drastic alteration of the structure of capitalist industry.

The policy pursued in the past for dealing with temporary causes of unrest has proved to be unsatisfactory and inadequate. The negative policy of ignoring industrial differences and potential causes of discontent until the workers "down tools" or threaten an immediate stoppage of work is dangerous to the national interests and fatal to industrial confidence and harmony. A positive policy is required. Any claim or demand or complaint put forward by a section of workpeople ought to receive prompt attention, and it is the duty of the Government of the day to see that no body of employers or employers' organisation adopts an attitude of delay or

indifference towards the workers' demands. The Government should endeavour to anticipate industrial unrest by removing or causing to be removed all legitimate grievances without delay. Existing machinery for conciliation and negotiation has frequently been used not to expedite but to delay the settlement of differences referred for decision, and this practice must cease if the workers are to retain any confidence in the value of such machinery. In the past employers have been able to avoid the payment of large sums in wages as the result of indefensible delay in negotiation and arbitration, and in order to render this policy of calculated delay non-effective, awards and agreements should be made retrospective to the date of the original official application. In addition to a speeding up and extension of machinery for negotiation in the various trades or industries, it is of great importance that some new permanent machinery of a national character with advisory powers, representative of the employers' organisations and trade unions, should be established without delay in order to exercise a salutary and pacific influence on industry and to advise the Government as to the necessary steps to be taken with a view to the prompt and satisfactory settlement of industrial differences. Such machinery might take the form of a large National Conference composed of an equal number of employers' representatives and trade union representatives, covering the whole of industry on the broadest possible basis and elected in such a democratic manner as to ensure the confidence of the mass of the workers. This Conference should elect a Standing Council or Commission equally representative of the trade unions and the employers' organisations, each section to elect its own delegates to the Council in such a manner as to ensure representation for all groups of industries. Such a body should meet frequently and carefully watch the trend of events in industry and make recommendations, either to the Government as to official action, or to the National Conference as to joint or separate action, with a view to promoting industrial peace by a proper settlement of questions or disputes which may threaten to lead to unrest or stoppages of work. The Minister of Labour for the time being should be President of the National Conference, and he should have the right to appoint the Chairman of the Standing Council or Commission. Though the functions of such machinery would be purely advisory, it would nevertheless be able to exert a strong moral influence in the settlement of industrial troubles.

A prolific cause of unrest is unemployment and the fear of unemployment, and in considering this problem, it is necessary to take a much wider view than has been customary hitherto. The inability of all workers to secure full employment is linked up with such questions as under-consumption, the employment of women and of child labour, and the insecurity of tenure of the workers. It is highly desirable that a commission should be set up immediately to make a close and comprehensive investigation into the causes primary and contributory, and to make recommendations as to the steps which ought to be taken with a view to limiting if not altogether removing this evil of unemployment, and especially as to the measures to be adopted in order to stimulate home consumption.

In the meantime, in order properly to deal with existing unemployment and under-employment, a non-contributory scheme of maintenance allowances covering all workers should be instituted without delay, and should be administered as far as possible directly through the trade unions. Such maintenance allowance should be sufficient to guarantee to the unemployed or under-employed worker a minimum standard of comfort.

A national minimum wage should be established in order to secure to all workers a reasonable general standard of living. Pending the enactment of a minimum wage, the present wages of the workers should be safeguarded by the extended operation of the Wages (Temporary Regulation) Act.

Hours of labour must be reduced. A minimum eight-hours working day or a forty-eight-hours week should be fixed. This legal maximum, however, should not prevent the workers in particular industries maintaining any better conditions that may now exist, or securing better conditions in the future by agreement. Systematic overtime should be prohibited; night work and Sunday work where possible should be prohibited, and where unavoidable, should be carefully regulated.

The housing of the people is an urgent problem demanding immediate action on the part of the Government and of local authorities. It is a national responsibility, and the national resources must be utilised to secure the immediate provision of sufficient houses to meet the people's requirements. A general improvement in housing conditions is also imperative in the interest of public health and for the convenience and comfort of the working-class households.

The question of profiteering during the war has been a factor in aggravating unrest, and the Government should institute Royal Commissions, half the membership of each to be nominated by organised Labour, to elicit and elucidate all the facts regarding war profiteering in each industry. This is of vital importance, in view of the enormous war debt which will have to be met by taxation, and it will be necessary to devise a plan whereby the burden of taxation will fall in proportion to ability to pay.

Much trouble arises from the non-recognition or the qualified recognition of many trade unions. All trade unions and federations or associations of trade unions which are recognised by the Labour movement must be fully and frankly recognised by the State, by local authorities, and by employers and employers' organisations. This recognition of trade unions must be the basis of all negotiations between employers and workmen.

In the past the general basis of national policy has been the maintenance of the existing system of industrial organisation, conducted under private ownership and control for the benefit of a section of the community. A new and comprehensive policy which contemplates and prepares for drastic changes in industrial organisation is now needed. It is not sufficient to attempt to remove temporary causes by conceding particular demands of a limited character, or by slight adjustments of the present system, or by the resort to such expedients as profit-sharing with a view to reinsuring

the existing system against the larger demands of Labour. The workers generally repudiate the motive of private profit and the system of capitalist control. Public ownership and democratic control of industry must supersede private ownership and control. We must begin to build up a new system in which the motive of private gain will cease to operate, by nationalising such vital national industries and public services as coal mines, railways, food supply, electric power supply, shipping. It will be impossible to effect a complete change in one step, but a substantial beginning could be made at once, and the system of public control, which has been resorted to with good results during the war, should be retained and extended to cover all vital industries and services which cannot be nationalised immediately. The system of ownership by municipal and local authorities should also be developed.

The inauguration on a substantial scale of the system of public ownership and the extension of the system of public control should be accompanied by a full recognition of the claim of the workers to an equal interest in the management of the various industries and a larger measure of control over the working conditions which affect them.

Finally, it must be stated that whatever remedies are adopted with a view to allaying the causes of the present unrest, they will fail to effect more than a temporary settlement unless a real effort is made in the direction of substituting the interests of the community as a whole for the interests of individuals. The motive of public service and public welfare should be the keystone of our industrial system, but this cannot be accomplished so long as industry continues to be run under private ownership for private gain. The war has changed old values and created new standards, and to-day the worker in industry refuses to regard himself or to be regarded as the instrument of his employer. During the war he was a national unit, contributing to the common effort and sacrifice; and he desires to continue, in peace conditions, the servant only of the community as a whole. This is one of the reasons why the question of public ownership and democratic control has become a principal demand, especially amongst the miners, railwaymen, and transport workers. To bring about industrial peace, we must begin at once to build a new industrial structure, not in the interest of capital, but in the interest of the community. This will involve tremendous changes, and the need to-day is for a new industrial policy which will carry the nation safely through the drastic alterations which the workers are demanding. National interest demands increased national output. This does not depend upon long hours and unsatisfactory conditions of employment. It does certainly depend largely on securing increased confidence between all who are concerned in the success of industry. It is essential, therefore, that the causes of the general unrest should be examined and solutions adequate to the needs of the case speedily applied if we are to remain a powerful unit in world development.

ARTHUR HENDERSON.

GERMANY TRIES DEMOCRACY.

FOUR months ago a revolution took place in Germany, of which the outcome was that the Kaiser and the Crown Prince fled over the frontiers, all the other German kings and princes were compelled to abdicate, a working-man was elevated to the place of chief authority in the State, a National Constituent Assembly was chosen by direct, secret, and universal voting on the proportional system, the army threw off the authority of the old officer caste, and very generally subjected members of it to contumely. During the four months which have elapsed since then it has been a stock journalistic *cliché* in most English papers that there is no change in Germany.

In view of the broad facts just described, this theory would seem to put a strong demand upon the British public's faculty of going by faith in newspaper articles, rather than by sight. But it probably did not over-estimate the public's faculty in this respect, trained as that faculty has been by the war literature of four years. In the matter of statements with regard to Germany, a writer is probably justified in regarding the danger of common-sense criticism, so far as the great mass of his readers go, as non-existent.

When one asks whether Germany was changed by the Revolution one must distinguish a number of questions which are all muddled together in common discussion. There is first the question, Did Germany really become democratic? This is quite different from the question, Did Germany become good? You find people often speak as if the two things were the same. Democracy means that the government of a State is carried on in general accordance with the will of the majority of the people, and more or less under the control of the majority. But there is nothing in the nature of things to make the will of the majority of a people necessarily good. The mass of a nation may be swayed by national ambition, war-fever, hatred, pride, suspicion, just as much as a ruling caste. All that democracy means is that, whether the will of the majority is good or bad, that will is reflected in the action of the State.

Does the existing Government in Germany, headed by Fritz Ebert the saddler, represent the will of the majority of the German people? In the old Greek republics, it was possible for the people to vote as a single whole in one market-place or theatre; but wherever you have representative democracy, as in Great Britain, France, and America to-day, the correspondence between the will of the electors and of the elected can never be quite perfect. The divergence is apt to increase as time elapses after each fresh election. The theory of democracy in Great Britain, France, and America is that, although the elected representatives of the people may not reflect the popular will with absolute precision, still the result of an election must be accepted for a term of years as the best index it is possible to get of what the people want.

Now it has never been questioned that the elections which put the present German Government in power were honestly held by universal franchise as lately as last January, and that the present German Government, unlike the Government in the fallen Hohenzollern Empire, is bound by the new Constitution to resign the

moment it loses the confidence of the elected Assembly. Whatever may be said against the new Germany, one would have thought it impossible to deny that it is democratic. But we have granted that Germany might have become democratic without undergoing a moral change of heart. Is it true to say, as the newspapers do over and over again, that Germany is utterly "unrepentant"? A complete "repentance" on the part of Germany would presumably imply *both* (1) its sincere repudiation of the principles of the old régime, and (2) contrition for particular evil actions.

The state of the case really seems to be that the principles of the old Government—all that was covered by the terms *Machtpolitik* (Power-policy) or *Gewaltpolitik* (Force-policy), the ambition to force the German will upon the world by sheer strength, the theory that all actions directed to this end were legitimate, the glorification of war—are sincerely repudiated by the parties now in power in Germany. All the stories which crop up again and again, of new aggressive designs on the part of the German Government, of sudden manifestations of "truculence", arrogance one day and climbing down the next, are illusion. Invented generally in the first instance with a calculated purpose, they are caught up ignorantly and avidly in the offices of the evening newspapers, because they furnish good sensational headlines and administer a pleasantly gentle shock to jaded business-men going home to the suburbs after their day's work. The truth is that the German people is far too aware of its complete helplessness to entertain any aggressive or truculent or "neo-Imperialist" designs at present. It is a people broken in spirit and physically prostrate for a long time to come. That the Germans desire to get sufficiently upon their feet again to secure tolerable conditions of life at home may be admitted; I gather that some newspaper writers consider that this is in itself a proof of incorrigible ambition. The truth is that there are quarters, we need not specify them now, in which the desire (which our statesmen have always disclaimed) of annihilating Germany really does prevail. But the Englishman feels a repugnance to kicking a man when he is down: we in the twentieth Christian century may take credit for being still at the point reached by the ancient Romans 2,000 years ago, whose ideal (however much their practice fell below it) was expressed in the words:—

bellante prior, jacentem
lenis in hostem.*

The only way, therefore, in which the British people can be induced to abuse their victory is by their being made to believe that the enemy is not really down.

It seems to me impossible for anyone who has read the German papers and periodicals in the period following the collapse and has considered the reports of the best observers, to question that the new Germany created by the Revolution repudiated the principles of the old Germany. I know of no *genuine* evidence to show that this repudiation was insincere. But it is true that on the question of

* "Keeping the upper hand over his enemy whilst he is fighting, lenient to him when he is down."—Horace, *Carmen Saculare*.

facts the Germans generally still hold to a view that we believe to be untrue. It is of capital importance in this connection to distinguish clearly between the question of facts and the question of principles. We must remember that the number of Germans who were eye-witnesses of the atrocities were, after all, only a relatively small fraction of the German people. The fabric of illusion created by the old Government's home propaganda did not instantly disappear. If a German, for instance, had up to the time of the Revolution firmly believed that the "Lusitania" was a troopship or was crammed with munitions of war, as most Germans still do, the fact that a revolution occurred would not prove to him straight away that events which took place four years ago had been different from what he had always believed them to be. The psychological process is revealed in an article by Franz Thimme, late Librarian of the Prussian Upper House, a man whose writings are distinguished by an un-Prussian note of amiability. Referring to the earlier days of the war, he writes* :—

"What strengthened us in our faith and confidence was that practically all of us, to the humblest member of the community, were convinced that we had moral right on our side. To-day, after all that has been divulged as to the origin of the war, we no longer feel quite so sure of it. We no longer deny that there were faults on our side, amongst those who wanted war and worked for its continuance. Yet we can still hold up our heads as against our enemies. However much we may have sinned by commission and omission, the greater guilt undoubtedly is upon the side of the Entente Powers. The encirclement of Germany, &c. . . ."

This is the position almost universally taken in Democrat and Majority Socialist circles. They have receded from the old claim to have all the right on their side. They have moved as far as admitting *Schuld* (guilt), but it must be a *Mitschuld* (a guilt shared with others). We may take for example an utterance of the *Münchener Neueste Nachrichten* on the last day of last year :—

"In this dark hour we must recognise and acknowledge that we stand on the brink of the abyss. Perhaps we have deserved our fate in the sense in which every nation deserves its fate. We bear a share of guilt (*Mitschuld*) for the epoch of William II., and a share of guilt for the course taken by the Revolution. But it is unworthy and hysterical to exaggerate out of all due proportion our share of guilt in the origination and the conduct of the war by cringing self-abasement before our enemies, to ask for the lash with cowardly bent back, like a slave. That is Oriental, not German. It is both unworthy and politically futile. It is infinitely more important that every individual should examine himself and set before his own conscience what measure of guilt for the collapse rests upon him personally, how far he himself was a corrupt creature of his time. And out of this self-knowledge, which need not be lachrymose and unmanly, the resolve must immediately grow, never again to fall into the old mistakes, but to go to meet the dawn of a new time as a new man."

Now if we are right in believing that in the particular quarrel out of which the war arose in 1914 the predominant share of the guilt

* *Deutsche Politik* for Jan. 24, p. 108.

rests upon Germany and Austria, the German admission of a *Mitschuld* cannot be regarded as satisfactory. It does not go far enough. Yet we may surely register a movement of the German mind which might encourage us, if a change of heart in Germany were what we really desired. It seems unreasonable to expect that the true facts, as we see them, should break upon the Germans all of a sudden in their totality. According to the ordinary laws of human psychology, it takes some time for an individual or a nation to recast their whole system of beliefs. It is fair also to remember that under conditions of acute physical distress and fear of the future it requires a somewhat rare degree of detachment to be occupied with pure moral valuation, even with the valuation of one's own past actions. When a man is suffering and horribly afraid, it might be morally more commendable in him to be thinking primarily of his sins, but, human nature being what it is, the chances are that his pain and his fear will hold the foreground of his thoughts.

One reason which the newspapers sometimes give for disbelieving that there is any change in Germany is that sudden conversions (so they say) do not take place. The Ethiopian and his skin, the leopard and his spots, and so on—one knows the old tags. Now, as a matter of fact, the change in Germany does not mean that all those who before the collapse drove the country along the path of *Gewaltpolitik* have suddenly become lambs. It means that the chief power has been transferred to another set of people in the country. The Revolution took the power out of the hands of that class and transferred it to the Social Democrats. The Social Democrats never approved of the principles of the Government; they never ceased to protest against them.

Of course, there are thousands still in Germany who hold fast the principles of the old *régime*. But they have become a discredited minority; they can no longer impress their principles upon the German State, any more than the Democrats and Socialists before the Revolution could impress their principles upon the State. And in between these stubborn reactionaries and the Social Democrats there are the great masses of men who fluctuate under the influences of the hour. The Revolution brought indeterminate numbers surging over to the Republican and Socialist side. Democracy and international fellowship were the fashion of the hour; force-policy and national aggrandisement were fallen into bad repute. Many, no doubt, conformed to the new fashion insincerely; many were simply carried by the prevailing current, but many, we may believe, really revised their political creed.

Some people say that the coming of the Social Democrats to power meant no real change, because they, too, had identified themselves during the war with the old Imperial Government. But their position is very imperfectly understood amongst us. It is true that they steadily voted war-credits and tried to help their country to victory. They stood—the greater number, one may believe, sincerely—for “no annexations,” no change of the frontiers of July, 1914, except minor rectifications by agreement. They fought against every idea of Germany's retaining Belgium or any part of Northern France, as much as against every idea of

Germany's ceding Alsace-Lorraine or Posen. They said that if ever at any moment the enemy expressed his readiness for a peace on the basis of the *status quo ante* and their own Government wanted to continue the war, they would stop voting war-credits, and, if necessary, make revolution. But so long as the enemy wanted to tear away bits of Germany they had no choice, they said, but to go on working for Germany's victory.

Now, if the *status quo* before the war was itself unjust, we had good ground for maintaining that it must be changed to the disadvantage of the Hohenzollern and Habsburg Empires, or a better world could never be built upon a stable foundation. I think events have justified those of us who were for the break-up of Austria-Hungary. The German Socialists were trying to keep an unjust state of things in being. But what ought they to have done? They ought, no doubt, from the point of view of the purest morality, to have said: "Though our country is apparently victorious, still it ought, out of a regard to abstract justice, to cede considerable territories which it possessed in 1914, and our ally, the Habsburg Empire, ought to consent to be broken up and disappear from the world." That would have been the high moral line. But how many in any nation would have taken it, men being what they are? Let us try to be honest about that.

Remember that the German Socialists had no choice but to work either for a German victory or for a German defeat. There was no middle course. After the peace of Brest-Litovsk it was plain to everybody that a German victory would mean conquests which violated all Socialist principles. But a German defeat would mean the detachment of some of its former territories from Germany and the break-up of Austria-Hungary. Only a few Socialists of the extreme Imperialist wing, such as Heilmann, expressed satisfaction with the Brest-Litovsk peace. The spokesmen for the bulk of the party protested against it. They continued, in spite of their protest, to vote war-credits. It was, they said, a choice of evils for them; either by continuing to vote war-credits they must acquiesce in German annexations or by refusing to vote war-credits they must contribute to annexations being made at Germany's expense, and of the two evils the second appeared to them the greater. Just as they had not sufficient power in the State to compel the German Government to deal justly in the day of its power, so they could not reckon, they said, on the Socialist bodies in the enemy countries being able to compel those countries to deal justly with Germany, if Germany were brought to the ground.*

I think it doubtful whether history, when it reviews this period, will pronounce that the German Majority Socialists did all they might have done to stigmatise and stop the atrocities committed in the name of Germany in the course of the war. But it is not true to say, as is often said on our side, that they made no effort. In the matter, for instance, of the Belgian deportations, they declared their disapproval of the German Government's action. I have

* German writers say that these doubts have been confirmed, so far, by events: "The next few months must show whether Western Socialism has become a power or is about to become one. To-day it still shows itself as declamatory impotence (*eine deklamierende Ohnmacht.*) *Deutsche Politik* for Feb. 7, p. 162.

recently seen a claim put forward by a Social Democrat that their opposition brought about some mitigation of the measures in question. If we cannot accept an assertion of this kind without proof, neither, I think, are we in a position to prove the contrary assertion, that they did *nothing*.

Another argument often used to prove that there has been no real change is that the *personnel* of the old bureaucracy are largely left still in office and that the new National Assembly contains so many familiar figures of the old Reichstag. But the important thing is whether the central brain directing the movements of the machine has changed. It is quite evident that any German Government, which is not going to try the experiment of a Bolshevism run by people destitute of all political education, must use the services of numbers of the old politicians and officials. Many of these may be among that fluctuating intermediate mass alluded to above, who in November were swept by a popular movement of feeling from a belief in *Machtpolitik* to a belief in Democracy. Others may be unchanged in heart, though they are willing to serve as instruments for the Government in power. Of course, it would be absurd to suppose that in a situation of such difficulty and confusion the new Government has not made some unfortunate mistakes in the choice of its agents and spokesmen. Yet if any of those who run down the present German Government as a whole were invited to draw up a list of the men that they think the Germans would call to office if they really meant to do the right thing, whom would they suggest?

One has to realise that the campaign to discredit the new German Government is not carried on from one side only. It is partly, as has been said, due to the instigation of those who want to inflict the maximum of loss and enfeeblement upon Germany, whilst Germany is down, or whose ambitions and desires would be frustrated if the Entente Powers went no further than justice and honour allowed. But it is also due to attacks from the Bolshevik end of the line. The Spartacists, too, and their allies amongst the Independent Socialists,* are always declaring that the present German Government is simply the old militarism over again. They would say the same thing of any Government which used any force to suppress mob-rule. Their theory, apparently, is that any casual crowd may sweep the streets with machine-guns, may storm Government buildings and newspaper offices, but if the Government move a soldier or a policeman to put a stop to this, they are *Blut-hunde*, sanguinary tyrants of the worst dye, worshippers of force. A curious complication is that the Spartacist denunciations filter through to some of our own Liberal and Labour papers, producing in their columns no less confusion than exists in the Jingo Press. The same Labour papers, in which at one moment our continuing to carry on war against Germany is denounced on the ground that Germany has changed, at another moment retail Spartacist asser-

* It is significant that two of the finest minds among the Independent leaders, Edward Bernstein and Karl Kautsky, have chosen to co-operate with the Socialist party in power. If we in England rightly attached great weight to the testimony of these two men against the old German Government, it is reasonable for us to regard their recent action as evidence of a real change in the German State.

tions to the effect that Germany is still the same. A correspondent of the "Manchester Guardian" a little while ago was sending the Bolshevik view of things to his paper as the true one: "The formidable military machine, which seemed to be crushed for ever, has risen again with astounding rapidity. . . . Germany is now under the control of the same elements which applauded and carried on the war, etc." And the messages of this correspondent were reproduced with triumph by the "Morning Post"—what it had always said! This surely was one of life's little ironies.

Let us be clear about it. The alternatives in Germany are either a Democrat and Majority Socialist Government, such as the present one, or the experiment of Government by Workmen's and Soldiers' Soviets of the Bolshevik type, with a possible return in the end to monarchy and reaction. We must make up our minds which we want to see. Our Hun-eating Press wants to belabour both the German Government and the Spartacists indiscriminately: Mr. Snowden and Mr. Lansbury (one gathers) want equally indiscriminately to defend both the German Government and Bolshevism. Either way one is bound to get entangled in strange contradictions. If we really want the Bolshevik system or want of system to prevail in Germany, as some of our Labour circles possibly do, then we cannot logically blame our own Government for continuing the pressure on Germany. According to the Spartacist (Bolshevik) view, our Government has had a good ground for doing so: the rulers in Germany are still as militarist and iron-fisted, as deceitful and unscrupulous, as ever. And the pressure we have exerted during these months upon Germany has been more helpful than anything we could have done to bring about a breakdown of the existing system and open the way for the Spartacist millennium.

If, on the other hand, we want the present Democrat-Socialist Government to remain in control, then the way to get our desire realised is not to carry on a campaign of disparagement against that Government, to say on every occasion that the new Germany for which it stands is just as bad as the old, that its democracy is camouflage, that its ambitions and principles are unchanged, and all the other things which during the last few months have been repeated by a kind of fixed mental habit.

It is unfortunate that some of those organs of opinion which stand for the humanitarian point of view are discredited by the line they took whilst the old Germany was still unbroken and dangerous. One dishonest move after another, one pretence after another calculated to weaken our resolution, put forward by the statesmen of the old system—Bethmann Hollweg, Michaelis, Hertling, Kühlmann, Czernin—was met by those organs on our side with sympathetic construction and apology. It is the fable of the child who always cried "Wolf" reversed. These circles cried "Sheep" every time the wolf put on sheep's clothing. When the wolf really does give place to a sheep, they have forfeited the power they might have had to convince the British public of the truth. And others who were substantially right, when the Hohenzollern system still held together, go bellowing on, without any modulation, when the circumstances have become completely different.

EDWYN BEVAN.

THE FINANCIAL SITUATION AND THE WAY OUT.

THE other day I was in a railway carriage with two haggard-looking men in shabby-genteel black coats. They were clerks, I should think, half-starved and over-worked. I could not help overhearing a part of their murmured conversation, and the gist of it was: "Since the war we cannot make both ends meet." These sad folk, I thought, are types of their country. Troubled by confusions and discontent, the country has a haggard look, and the cause of it is that, since the war, it cannot make both ends meet. It is a dark outlook, but we had better confront it. We had better take careful thought what the ends are, and how far they are apart. When we are clear about that, we shall be half-way towards finding how to make them meet.

THE BALANCE OF TRADE.

The finances of the Government are a reflection of the finances of the nation as a whole, so before we consider the financial position of the Government, let us consider some aspects of the financial position of the nation. It is a position very easily defined. It is that of a household that has been enormously overspending its income. The extent to which the nation is overspending its income can be guessed from the following figures of foreign trade.

VALUE OF EXPORTS AND IMPORTS IN £.

TWELVE MONTHS TO DECEMBER 31ST.

(OO,000 OMITTED.)

			<i>Food, Drink, and Tobacco.</i>		<i>Raw Materials.</i>		<i>Manufactured Articles.</i>
1918.							
Imports	5727	...	4589	...	2802
Exports (British)	121	...	608	...	4037
1913.							
Imports	2902	...	2818	...	1930
Exports (British)	326	...	699	...	4114

In 1918 the value of our foreign and colonial exports, due to our position as the world's warehouse, was 31 millions, and in 1913 it was 109.6 millions. Adding up the totals we find that in 1913 our imports exceeded our exports in value by 133.9 millions, whereas in 1918 the excess had risen to 790 millions. We are taking values here and not quantities, because we are considering our monetary position, and not our position as regards employment.

In 1913 the excess of imports of 133.9 millions represented interest due upon our foreign investments and payments for our invisible exports, which were the services of our ships and of our banks. During the war the greater part of our foreign investments have been sold, and in the disorganised state of international trade the return received for the services of our banks has been greatly reduced. How, then, are we now paying for that 790 millions worth of goods by which our imports exceed our exports? A large part of it,

no doubt, still represents payment for the services of our ships. The tonnage is reduced in quantity, it is true, but freights are much higher. The balance, and an enormous balance it is, we are meeting in the same way that a householder has to meet his deficit when his expenditure exceeds his income. In his race with the constable the householder, in order to make good his deficit, sells his securities, mortgages his property, and finally has to take to raising money on promissory notes and I.O.U.s from whatever moneylender he can persuade to give him credit. As a nation we have been doing the same thing. We have sold our securities abroad and now we are busily mortgaging our capital assets in order to raise money to pay for imports for which we cannot pay in exports. Worst of all, we have raised enormous sums in the United States and in the neutral countries on promissory notes and I.O.U.s. "Treasury bills and other short-dated securities" is what we call these documents, and that sounds better, but it makes no difference to their nature, which is that of an I.O.U. The money which the Government has raised on these bills it has used to pay for the goods that it has bought in the United States and elsewhere abroad, or it has lent it to the banks there to be re-lent to other British importers who have goods to pay for, and thus the borrowings are made available to pay for the excess of imports. We have, no doubt, at the same time been lending large sums to our Allies and to the Dominions. But the worst of it is that their debts to us are very likely to be, many of them, bad debts, whereas our debts to others have got to be good debts. In any case, we cannot have lent abroad nearly as much as we have borrowed. There is a big balance of foreign debt against us, out of which we have paid for that excess of imports: and it is going to give us trouble. How big only the future can show, when the international money market and the market in exchange are set free to work on normal lines. Meanwhile it is very clear that to have changed our state from that of a creditor nation to that of a debtor nation, even though it be a temporary change only, is a very unpleasant thing. A nation that has done so is no longer wholly free and independent. Its sovereignty in its own affairs is qualified by the power of its creditors, and it is in danger of falling into the position of a dependent hanger-on in the international family. We have not come to that yet, but the most casual consideration of the figures quoted above shows that that is the direction in which we are proceeding, and that that is the position to which we shall be reduced unless by a great and immediate effort the rake's progress can be stopped.

And how to stop it? There is no ingenious expedient that will avail; no other expedients but those that would serve in the case of an extravagant householder: to spend less money and to get more. The situation is so grave that it still calls upon every citizen for efforts and sacrifices as great now as those made during the war. It calls upon him rigidly to reduce his consumption, especially of luxuries, and thus to set goods and labour free for the export trade. It calls upon him to go on saving every penny that he can, and thus to cheapen the supply of capital that is needed for the revival of industry. It calls upon him to occupy himself industriously

with some productive work, and thus to make a direct contribution towards the liberation of the nation from its yoke of debt. The great work of the deliverance of England from military enemies has been accomplished with incredible sacrifice. The work of delivering her from the threat of financial bondage has yet to be accomplished at the cost of sacrifices, less tragic indeed, but unattended by the alleviations of applause and of the inspiration of conflict.

Without individual effort the Government can do nothing, but with it the Government can do much. In particular it can promptly and boldly remove all restrictions upon exports to neutral countries. Why should it not? The war is over. Can anyone now suppose that the amount of such exported goods that might find its way into Germany from neutral countries would enable our enemy to harden his heart like Pharaoh, and to renew the persecution of the chosen people? And until our export trade is allowed freely to resume its wonted course, how can we expect our industries to revive?

NATIONAL DEBT.

Another aspect of our difficulties in making both ends meet is that of the National Debt. A convenient measure of the extent to which we have got behindhand during the war is provided by some summary figures published weekly by the "Economist."

TOTAL NATIONAL EXPENDITURE, AUGUST 1ST, 1914, TO
MARCH 31ST, 1919 (000,000 OMITTED).

							£
Total spent	9339
Raised by Revenue	2538
Net borrowing	6801

Included in the total spent is a sum of 1,683 millions advanced by way of loan to our Allies. How much of this we shall ever see back it is impossible to say. It would probably be prudent to entertain no very high hopes on the subject. It appears, then, that we have had during the war to meet 73 per cent., or nearly three-quarters of our total national expenditure by borrowing.

Having contemplated for a moment that melancholy record, let us turn to the present state of the capital account of our National Debt. In the fiscal year 1917-18 the aggregate gross liabilities of the State increased by 1,857 millions to 5,921 millions. On March 31st next we may expect to find that they fall not much short of 7,800 millions. Against these gross liabilities we shall be able to set as assets some 32 millions only, chiefly in respect of Suez Canal shares. The annual charge for interest and management of this debt will be round about 400 millions. In 1913 who would have thought it possible that in six years' time we should be raising annually for the service of our debt a sum a good deal more than half of our total National Debt at that period?

Everybody holds it as an article of faith that this enormous increase of debt is a grave and menacing thing; but since that faith is usually of a vague nature it is

worth while to see what the increase means and what is the nature of its menace. It means in the first place that an equivalent amount of the nation's wealth in material and labour has been withdrawn from productive industry, from trade and commerce, and has been placed in the hands of the State, for the purposes of the war, in return for a charge upon the taxable capacity of the nation. That wealth now exists only in the fragments of iron which are scattered over the battlefields of the world, in the particles of explosive gases which are distributed in its atmosphere, in similar unmarketable articles. It is gone, and gone for good. Nothing will bring it back again, and it is no good crying over spilt milk. Why, then, it may be said, worry about the National Debt at all? It is, after all, a domestic affair. The original consumption of wealth represented by the capital sum was no doubt a great disaster, but all that the subsequent annual service of the debt means is that money is taken out of one pocket of the nation in the form of taxes and returned into another of its pockets in the form of interest: and the total wealth of the nation is not thereby affected.

That may be true as far as it goes. But there are, nevertheless, many good reasons for lightening the burden of our deadweight debt as quickly as we can. In the first place, the time will come when we shall want to borrow again, and when it does, the better our credit, the more easily and the more cheaply shall we be able to raise the money that we want. Our credit depends upon the value of the asset that we have to pledge as security for loans, and our asset in this connection is the taxable capacity of the nation. The more that we can free our taxable capacity from existing charges the better will be the position of our state in its future appearances as a borrower. Secondly, to undertake as soon as possible the task of paying off the debt will greatly assist us in the discharge of those essential duties of saving and economy to which reference has already been made. It will help us by obliging us to save, and to set aside out of income a certain annual sum. That sum, being used to redeem National Debt, will come into the hands of the investing class, who will use it for the most part as capital to be employed in various forms of industry. We might, perhaps, save voluntarily: but it will be an excellent thing to have a fixed program of saving to fortify our good resolutions.

It has to be admitted that the happy moment at which we shall be able to begin to pay off the National Debt has not yet arrived. It will not arrive, as will be seen, during the financial year 1919-20. For the present our efforts must be directed towards the kindred object of allowing as little increase in the debt as possible. But the time will come, and when it does we should be prepared immediately to begin the good work of re-establishing our Sinking Funds on a scale proportionate to our increased liabilities.

THE BUDGET.

Proceeding from the general situation of the nation to the particular and immediate situation of the Government, we come now to those two ends which the Chancellor of the Exchequer will in the financial year 1919-1920 be unable to persuade to meet.

The Armistice will enable him to bring them much closer into contact than they have been in any of the War Budgets, but it will not enable him to bring them together, or anywhere near it. There will be an enormous deficit in the coming financial year. The following figures show what it will be, as nearly as it is possible to forecast it at present.

ESTIMATED NATIONAL EXPENDITURE.

(000,000 OMITTED.)

	1919-1920.	1918-1919.
Service of the Debt	400	...
Army	287	326'4
Navy	149	} 2695'6
Air Force	66'5	
Ministry of Munitions ⁵ (Token Vote) ...	0'5	
Civil Service, Revenue Departments, and Post Office	495	
Total	1398	3022

Owing to the system of financing by Votes of Credit, it is impossible at present to split up between the fighting services the total sum spent thereon for the year 1918-19. The estimate for the Ministry of Munitions is given in the form of a Token Vote only, which furnishes no clue as to the amount which the Government expects that department to cost in the coming year. But the realisation of surplus war stocks and of Government establishments during the year may be expected to bring in a sum at least equal to the total expenses of the department ; so that this item, it may be hoped, will not have any effect in swelling the deficit. There is not much satisfaction in that, however, for those who are disposed to think that the policy which is now being pursued by the Government of disposing of stocks and establishments at break-up prices, and subject to no Parliamentary control, is an ill-considered policy, and one that fails to make the best for the nation of valuable assets.

The formidable total estimated expenditure of 495 millions for the Civil Services includes 73 millions for the Ministry of Pensions, 31 millions for Demobilisation and Settlement, 50 millions for the Bread Subsidy, 87½ millions for loans to Dominions and Allies, and 60 millions for Railway Agreements under the New Transport Bill. We must derive what comfort we can from the reflection that the greater part of this expenditure is non-recurrent, and from the assurance of the Government that the expenses of the Civil Service, big as they may be in the coming financial year, were bigger still in that which is past.

To meet the total estimated expenditure of roundabout 1,400 millions in 1919-1920, the Chancellor may expect to receive on the existing basis of taxation a total revenue of 900 millions. But in the important item of Excess Profits Duty, which in 1918-19 was estimated to bring in no less than 300 millions, it is probable that the existing basis will not continue to exist. On the one hand, it is true, there are large arrears which, it may be expected, will be collected in the coming year ; but, on the other hand, the total of

such profits liable to taxation will undoubtedly diminish, and there is much to be said for a reduction in the rate of the duty. It undoubtedly tends to deter the employment of capital in fresh industrial undertakings, and it is an urgent need of the moment that the fertilising stream of capital should be enabled to flow into the industrial fields as copiously and freely as possible. Taking one consideration with another, it is probably prudent for us to anticipate that the yield of the Excess Profits Duty will be reduced in the coming year by one-half—that is 150 millions. The total revenue on the existing basis would then be 750 millions, and setting that against the total expenditure of 1,400 millions, the Chancellor is faced with a deficit of 650 millions.

To meet the whole of this deficit by fresh taxation is clearly impossible. All that can be said is that we should tax ourselves to the utmost to meet as much of it as we can, and that we must borrow the rest.

We have, in short, another year of war finance before us. But although that gloomy wood is still around us, we are beginning to see daylight through the trees. With reasonable foresight and careful economy in 1920-21 the State, at any rate, if not the nation, ought in a year's time to be able to bring together those two ends that have so long been strangers. The non-recurrent expenditure in the Civil Service estimates, to which reference has been made, should then be out of the way. Peace, let us hope, will have come, and with it a substantial reduction in the expenditure on the fighting services. We cannot, of course, hope to have reduced our expenditure by then to anything like the figure at which it stood before the war. The cost of Re-construction and of the Debt-Service must effectually prevent that. But, with a bold and imaginative policy for the restoration of industrial prosperity, and with the increased revenue which such a restoration alone can make possible, whoever it may be who has the task of preparing the Budget for 1920-21 should be able to congratulate himself and the country on their emergence from the wood of war finance.

HOW TO MEET THE DEFICIT.

To meet the greater part of the deficit there is nothing for it, as has been said, but to borrow. All borrowing is bad, but some borrowing is worse than other borrowing. The worst form of borrowing of all, it is generally recognised, is that which consists in empowering the Bank of England or the other banks to create paper credits to be lent to the Government. That is what is done when the Government raises money by means of deficiency advances from the Bank of England. The effect of it is that the currency is inflated by the amount of the advance, and that prices are forced up in proportion. The best form of borrowing is when the Government goes to the saving classes, and receives from them their accumulated wealth by selling them War Savings Certificates and War Bonds. In that case the Government is receiving credit which represents real wealth in goods and other produce of useful work. The increase in the currency which results from the

borrowing is no greater than the increase in the supply of commodities represented by the savings, and the borrowing has not the effect of raising prices. A point of good finance, then, in the coming year is that the Government should forswear those all-too-easy methods of getting paper credits out of the banks, and out of the Bank of England in particular, of which too much use has been made during the war.

There remain the questions of how much money can be raised by fresh taxation in the coming year, and of the direction in which the Chancellor can turn for it. We cannot get all that we want out of revenue, but that is no reason why we should not get all that we can. It will, I think, be generally admitted that to obtain any amount of additional income which would be worth having, it is no good turning towards any fancy form of taxation. Taxes on special luxuries and so on bring in but little revenue, and the cost of collecting them is high in proportion to their yield. For the big lump of fresh revenue that we want we must go to one or both of the two copious sources of revenue—the Income Tax and Customs and Excise.

There is but little prospect of getting much worth having from Customs or from Excise. The three best revenue yielders, beer, spirits, and tobacco, bear already a burden about as big as they are capable of bearing. Any increase in their load may be expected to result in such a reduction of consumption as would prevent any very substantial increase in the amount of revenue derived from them. There has been a conspicuous instance of this effect lately in Italy, where the increase of the burden on tobacco, a Government monopoly, led to a reduction in consumption, which disappointed all hopes of revenue from the source.

Reference must be made in this connection to a recent revival of the Protectionist movement. It is at present taking a form which has little direct bearing upon the question of revenue. Protection is to be given for a limited period to some of our industries, not by a tariff which might yield a certain amount of revenue, but by a direct prohibition against the introduction of the products of the industries concerned. Free-Traders may be inclined to think that as between two evil courses, a tariff and prohibition of imports, prohibition is the lesser evil of the two. At least, it does not bring considerations affecting the revenue down into the arena of that great conflict between the people and the interests. But, however that may be, it needs some emphasis at the present time, that the imposition of a tariff can have but little to recommend it for the particular purpose of raising revenue. With food prices at their present level, no Government would venture to suggest a tariff on food-stuffs. With the urgent need that we have for the immediate restoration of our great industries to activity of production, it is equally impossible that any Government should, by a tariff, increase the price of their raw materials. There remain only manufactured articles. Apart from the well-recognised difficulty of distinguishing between articles which are manufactured and those which are not, our imports of the former class are but small in comparison with

our imports of other classes, and the revenue that a tariff thereon would yield would be small too.

There is really only one possible direction in which the Chancellor can turn, and that is towards the Income Tax. More and more, as time goes on and our needs increase, does that, the best of taxes, become the mainstay of our revenue system. It is the best of taxes, or rather, it ought to be. At present the burden of it falls inequitably—on a part only of the population. There is no obvious reason why the tax should not be reformed so as to fall equitably on the incomes of the population as a whole. Let us look at a few figures illustrative of its incidence at present.

AMOUNTS OF INCOME TAX ON CERTAIN INCOMES.

<i>Income (earned).</i>	<i>Amount of Tax (nearest £).</i>		<i>Effective Rate.</i>	
£	£		s.	d.
200	9		0	11
400	31		1	7
800	120		3	0

INCOME TAX AND SUPER TAX.

<i>Income.</i>				
15,000	6,812		9	1
50,000	25,187		10	1
150,000	77,687		10	4

At first sight the taxes paid by the big incomes seem very satisfactory, but I believe that a moment's reflection will show that, according to the old canon that the best basis for a just taxation is equality of sacrifice, what these figures really show is the disproportionately heavy burden of taxation that is falling upon the medium incomes of the middle and lower-middle classes.

Consider a salaried manager, with his hard-earned income of £400 a year. Who that has any knowledge of or any capacity for imagining the circumstances of his life but must see that since the great rise of prices during the war, the £31 that he has to pay inflicts upon him a far greater sacrifice than a contribution of £6,812 inflicts upon the rich man with £15,000 a year? The rich man, after all, has over £8,000 a year left to live upon. I do not think that his sacrifice can be considered to approach within measurable distance that of the salaried manager, whose income is reduced by the tax to £369, the purchasing power of which has been reduced by at least 40 per cent. by the inflation of our currency during the war. Before we can make the Income Tax a trustworthy foundation-stone for our revenue system, we must put a bold face upon it and, by steepening the curve of the present graduation, equalise the sacrifice which is demanded from rich and poor alike.

Another change that is urgently to be recommended in the interests of sound and scientific taxation is that the tax should be made applicable to all incomes, even the smallest. There are few who will not agree that one of the worst features of our present revenue system is that the working-classes make their contributions

to the national revenue entirely in the form of indirect taxes, paid, without their knowing it, in the form of higher prices on dutiable or excisable articles. They are thus left in ignorance of how much they are contributing towards the national revenue and their responsibility for national expenditure is never brought home to them in a direct manner. An income-tax on wages would enable them to appreciate the nature of their responsibility and to measure its extent. It is suggested that a practical manner in which this great reform might be made would be, whilst imposing a small income-tax on wages, to be deducted by the employer, to make a simultaneous remission of indirect taxation upon tea, sugar, tobacco, and possibly beer, calculating the reduction of indirect taxation so that the relief given thereby to the budget of the working-class household would be equal to the fresh burden imposed upon it by the new direct tax. There can be little doubt that all enlightened opinion amongst the working classes would approve of the change.

Another and less fundamental reform in the tax that should precede any great change in its basis or extent is the simplification of the manner of its assessment and collection. At the present time it passes the wit of common man to discover beforehand what he has to pay, or to whom. The average income-tax payer lives in a state of perpetual obfuscation about how much he has to draw his cheque for, and when, and about how much he may expect to get back again. The Income Tax Act, even in its present codified form, is unintelligible except to a few experts, and the forms of return which pour upon us from different quarters are like examination papers in higher mathematics and economics. The whole of the present system of assessment—in geographical areas, by amateur tribunals of commissioners and local assessors, was designed for a bygone state of civilisation, and is now out of date and unsatisfactory. The geographical method should be abandoned, and every taxpayer subjected to a single assessment in respect of his whole income from every source, wherever that source may be situated. Further, his payment should be in the form of a net payment. For the State to exact payment at a higher rate than that at which a taxpayer is ultimately liable to be assessed, and subsequently to repay a balance, involves both State and taxpayer in unnecessary trouble and expense, and amounts in fact to a confession of mere incompetence on the part of the tax-collecting authorities.

These urgently-needed reforms, both in the basis of the tax and in its machinery, cannot, of course, be carried out in time for this year's Budget. The Chancellor may be expected to return to the Income Tax for a substantial addition to the revenue, and if he does so, he must do it upon the old basis, imposing thereby a fresh inequitable burden upon the small fixed incomes, which have already borne more than their fair share of the costs of the war. But reform of the Income Tax is in the air, and there is some hope that it may be re-established on an equitable and scientific basis and equipped with modern machinery before the Budget of 1920-21, when the State must needs make both ends meet, or confess that it is on the high road towards bankruptcy. To perform the gigantic task of raising the revenue that we shall require to secure our sol-

vency, a simplified and universal Income Tax, with a much steeper graduation of the rate, is, I believe, the only weapon that can avail. With that in his hands, the Chancellor will be furnished with an instrument by the use of which he will be able to get as much revenue as he wants, and as the nation can supply, with certainty, simplicity, and equity. If it were ever prudent to prophesy, one might say that, once the Government and the nation had had some experience of a simplified Income Tax, assessed at equitable rates, its advantages as a cheap, easy, and fair way of raising money would become so clear that the tendency would be gradually to abandon all other methods of taxation, especially the indirect methods. May it not be that that is the path which will lead the State soonest out of the financial wood in which it is straying? It is at least a practical suggestion. But the way will not be clear to get as much fresh revenue from the tax as we need, or to transfer to it the burden of taxation now derived from other and less equitable sources, until the administration of the tax is so reformed that the average un-financial man can understand what he has to pay, and, more important still, until public opinion is satisfied that the rates and scales of the tax exact from its payers an equality of sacrifice.

E. HILTON YOUNG.

THE PROSPECTS OF STARTING STATE FORESTRY.

IT has recently been the writer's duty to read through the recommendations of the committees and commissions which have reported upon forestry during the last thirty years. The experience has recalled a dim memory of an American song concerned with work upon a railway, which endlessly narrates the progress made year after year, but conveys a general impression that the railway was never built. So it has been with forestry. Much talk, and even a good deal done on the outskirts of the subject, but actual forestry—the scientific planting of trees so as to produce the maximum yield of timber, in places where but for State action or assistance the trees would not have been planted—has somehow (except on a small scale in the Crown Forests) not got itself accomplished. Though intention has been good, performance has always lagged behind. A Select Committee in 1887 recommended the appointment of a Forest Board, and thereupon a Board of Agriculture was appointed, which lacked the funds or the freedom to do anything effective for forestry. The Departmental Committee of 1902 resulted in progress in forestry education, but not in the setting up of the two large demonstration areas which it recommended in order to make the education really practical and effective. The Royal Commission on Coast Erosion put forward two schemes for afforesting nine million and six million acres, but as critics became unanimous that both schemes were too big, there was clearly ample justification for beginning neither. Then the Board of Agriculture for Scotland was started under the best auspices for forestry, for there was to be, in the words of the then Secretary for Scotland, “a department dealing with forestry as an integral and vital part of its administrative machinery.” Yet one may now go to the fine Edinburgh square in which the Board is housed and enquire for that department without finding it. Hopes deferred were revived by the appointment of the Development Commission, even though the Boards of Agriculture hailed its appointment as a glorious excuse for referring to it every proposal for promoting forestry and keeping their own funds for other purposes. And the Development Commission truly has been continually active in all sorts of excellent work. Before the war they had made grants of a million and a half, but somehow less than £70,000 went to forestry, and less than a tenth of that to planting. The advisory officers in forestry whose appointment the Commission made possible have given admirable service to the State; but, by a freak of fortune, far more in destroying timber, as officers during the war of the Timber Supply Department, than in getting it replaced. Even the Commission's own scheme for purchasing and planting six experimental areas, each of 5,000 acres, has been by them withdrawn. And latterly the grants that they have given for purchasing forest seeds, through no fault of theirs, but because in last season's weather seeds would not ripen, cannot be utilised at this time of special need, for the seed is not available.

No, it is no one's fault. Our country alone of civilised States has had no leader during the last hundred years who had at the same time the imagination and the power to initiate schemes on a large scale, of which the full benefit would only be realised by the State from fifty to a hundred years later. We have been content to say, "What has posterity done for me, that I should do anything for posterity?" There is now, however, a very simple answer that can be given to this question. During the last four and a-half years we *have* done something for posterity—we have loaded it with an extremely heavy debt. So if for a million which we may spend now we can give posterity twenty millions or more, and this owing to nature's automatic increment, we shall hardly be accused of undue solicitude for our successors.

But we must look closer into the question of safeguarding the future. The war has taught us a very sharp lesson as to the danger of dependence on foreign timber, which has been fully set out for us in the Report of the Reconstruction Sub-committee on Forestry (Cd. 8,881). Here are the facts. We have less of our total area under wood than any civilised country, except Portugal. We have considerably less growing timber even than Portugal per head of population. Countries now seem to need nearly an acre of timber per head if they are not to import. We have seven-hundredths of an acre—about a ten-rod allotment, in fact. That area was steadily and surely decreasing before the war, and has, of course, been still further decreased by the heavy war fellings.* Our woodlands produced before the war about one-third of the timber that they would have done had they been under correct silvicultural management, and less than eight per cent. of our total consumption. But our consumption has all the time been steadily growing in amount and cost. It has trebled in amount per head of the population in the last fifty years. The average prices of timber supplied from abroad had gone up 33 per cent. in the eighteen years before the war. We are becoming steadily more dependent on overseas supplies and of such supplies on those from foreign countries; for the proportion of our imports that we drew from the Empire was less than half in 1913 what it had been ten years earlier. And the foreign supplies on which we depend are virgin forests, which are being steadily depleted. "Russia is now the crux of the whole question"—this was the finding of the Committee in 1917. It is still truer now. So much for the general position. What has been our war experience? Though the timber imports in the first two years of the war were less than two-thirds of our pre-war import, we had to pay for them thirty-seven million pounds more than their pre-war value. They occupied fourteen million tons dead weight in our shipping, enormously decreased our power of bargaining with other countries (for we had to send our bargain driver coal in exchange for timber), and very seriously affected our financial exchanges. When in the middle of the war we had to fall back on our own resources because of the absolute impossibility of any longer devoting tonnage to timber, woods were found to be so

* It is worth noting that the area of State forests in Germany had increased by half a million acres in the thirty years before the war.

small and scattered, labour and plant so unavailable, and transport so difficult, that it took more than a year to secure any considerable output. And in spite of all our efforts, whether by import or home supply, it is certainly true to say that unless France had steadily during the last century developed a national timber policy, as we should have done and did not, the war could not have been won. Let us add three further points. The war has taught us that, from the point of view of providing for possible emergency, timber has the highest value of all commodities. It can be held in reserve after maturity with but slight loss. It can be used at almost any stage of its growth, and its bulk makes it much the most inconvenient of imports. Secondly, recent research has demonstrated, what only a few experts knew before, that for general timber-growing purposes we have one of the best soils and one of the best climates of any country in the world. Thirdly, there is no doubt whatever that sufficient of our land could be devoted to timber growing to make us self-supporting in timber during a period of three years, without interference with agricultural interests, and indeed with much advantage to agriculture and to rural settlement.

This, it must be admitted, makes a strong case for a forward national policy in forestry. It is, however, frankly based on the need for national security. Now, however, that the war is receding a little and can be seen in perspective, it may be questioned whether the need for security justifies an outlay on forestry of £15,000,000, which is the sum estimated by the Reconstruction Sub-committee for thoroughly establishing a comprehensive State scheme. It may be argued that the nations of the earth are now about to settle down so happily under the League of Nations that there will be no more wars, and that even though the boycott of goods may still be used as an international weapon, we have no right if we are sincere in entering the League to try to defeat a boycott by growing our own timber. Or, if this argument appears too quixotic, it may be argued more reasonably that no nation can by taking thought make sure what will be its vital point sixty or eighty years hence. Pure economics, therefore, is our only safe guide, which directs us to concentrate upon doing things which we know we can do better than other countries. And it will be added, as concerns timber, whatever may be said about the depletion of virgin forests, Scandinavia and Russia will always be able to send us cheaper timber from their natural growths than we can raise by man's planting. To this argument the main line of reply seems to be that a debtor nation, as we are likely to be for a century or more, cannot safely neglect the encouragement of resources of any kind which, though started by man, owe their increment to nature. This is particularly true of forests, for they make little claim to divert men from more productive work, they do something to keep a fair balance between town and country population, and they minister directly to national health. The most interesting point here is the contribution that can be made by forestry to economic life in country districts, and it is a point worth emphasising. Nothing impressed the Reconstruction Sub-committee more as they pursued their work than the

benefit which agriculture can derive from forestry. We expressed it thus:—

The districts which would benefit most are those which are now poorest and most backward, such as the hilly regions of northern England, Wales, and Ireland, the Border Country and, most of all, the Highlands of Scotland. No one disputes that large areas in these districts now devoted to sheep or deer ought, if possible, to be put to more productive uses. In these tracts, now almost uninhabited, the cost of reclamation and equipment is such that no agricultural development is economically possible unless some other industry is present to help to bear the preliminary outlay on roads, bridges, &c., and provide occupations to which the small farmer can turn in winter when he would otherwise be idle and to which his family can look for employment. In certain favoured localities, sea-fishing, mines or quarries may supply this want, but in many districts sylviculture and the industries based on it are the only agencies that can do so. The economic contrast between a valley where the hills are under wood and one where they are devoted to grazing or sport is little short of amazing. A thousand acres of hill grazing require the services of one, or at most two, shepherds, and have even on the best land of that type an annual production per acre of less than ten lbs. of mutton and two lbs. of wool. The same area under forest requires the services of ten men, besides occasional labour in nurseries and young plantations, and labour employed in industries dependent on the forest, while its annual production is, at a low estimate, 1,000 loads (50,000 cubic feet) of coniferous timber. When the woods extend to several thousands of acres, the new values they create become a potent factor in the development of the district, justify the building of roads, railways, and telegraphs, and serve to support churches, schools, doctors, shops, and many of the comforts and amenities of civilisation which are out of reach of the solitary crofter.

In pointing out the dependence of forestry operations in mountain districts on the labour supplied from small holdings, we wish to emphasise equally strongly the dependence of the latter on forestry as a subsidiary industry in these districts. In the absence of other sources of employment, as in the congested districts of Ireland and Scotland, small holdings not only prove an economic failure, but have in some cases formed centres of poverty and distress, necessitating the employment of State departments and the expenditure of large sums of public money for the provision of relief. In the Report of the Royal Commission on Congestion in Ireland, published in 1908, the Commissioners make the following statement: "In very many districts the people cannot live on the produce of the land, but have to depend very largely upon secondary sources of income of an uncertain and varying nature. They pay rent for a holding not so much for its agricultural value as because it furnishes a home for their family." A recent enquiry, conducted by Mr. Bryner Jones, Agricultural Commissioner for Wales, also indicates that the economic position of the average small farmer in the poorer hill districts of Wales is far from satisfactory. The earnings of tenants over the whole of one district investigated, and part of another, allowing for the value of farm produce consumed at home, ranged from 13s. 6d. to 21s. 6d. per week.

Such instances prove the desirability in all, and the necessity in most, districts of inaugurating afforestation either before or simultaneously with the creation of small holdings, and we consider it should be the duty of the Forest Authority to earmark lands suitable for small holdings on any areas they might acquire, the number of such holdings being increased as the expansion of the forest requires.

The Interim Forest Authority, in considering questions of woodland industries, has recently noticed another aspect of the same subject. Agriculture, rightly faced with higher wages, will turn to a greater use of machinery and to economy in men. Yet, however efficiently this is done, the arable farmer will always want extra men for the summer work. Migratory labour is from many points of view not satisfactory. Happy then would be the district which contains a forest or forest industries, such as the making of hurdles, baskets, handles, spokes, chair legs, hoops, staves, or spindles, from which men can be drawn to the farms during the "throng" time of year.

The passing of the war finds us in a period of high prices and high rates of interest, and this gives weight to a set of arguments against State forestry based on extracts from that romantic volume, "Inwood's Tables." Profitable forestry, it is argued, can be shown from the compound interest tables to be impossible whenever costs of planting and rates of interest are high. One who argues on these lines will, so to speak, flourish his Inwood in one hand and his Reconstruction Report in the other, and demolish the humble would-be forester without remorse. "Look at that estimate for planting," he will say, "at £5 10s. an acre—it can't now be done for less than £10. Then for land—£3 an acre, let that stand if you like, on the assumption that the owner will take a pre-war price. But the 6s. per acre per annum for maintenance, administration, road making, &c., must become 10s., owing to increased labour costs. Now then, we must take 5 per cent. as the rate of interest, and an eighty year rotation. What do the tables give us? At 5 per cent., £13 for eighty years is £645, and 10s. per annum for eighty years is £485, total £1,030; and here is your estimate of the total value of the yield of spruce on an eighty year rotation (Cd. 8,881, p. 101)—£185. Total loss per acre for the rotation £835. Q.E.D." The forester, if he knows "the little more and how much it is" of the tables, will pull himself together and reply gamely that it is wrong to compare post-war costs with pre-war prices, that it is unfair to take 5 per cent. as the rate of interest, for though Consols gave more than this after the Napoleonic wars they gave $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. in 1899, that a good deal of the land which will be planted will carry Douglas, Larch or Silka Spruce which will give a return on a sixty year rotation, and that the estimates of the total values of yields in the report are arrived at by a simple addition of the value of the thinnings with that of the final yield, without any allowance for reckoning the thinnings at compound interest from the time when they accrue. So he will reply with a counter calculation: "At 3 per cent., £13 for sixty years is £77, and 10s. per annum for sixty years is £82, total £159. Douglas gives £259 on a sixty year

rotation, correct this for the accumulated value of the thinnings, which makes it £277, assume that the values of timber go up in the same ratio as that which we have taken for the costs of producing it (roughly in the ratio of 5 to 3), and we get £465, which gives a profit per acre of £360. Q.E.D." And so they may "use great argument about it and about, but evermore go out by the same door wherein they went." For if we will realise that on a 5 per cent. basis the figures taken come to nearly three times as much on an eighty year rotation as they do on a sixty year rotation, and that for eighty years a 5 per cent. calculation produces nearly four times as much as one at 3 per cent., it will be seen that the profit or loss depends on small differences in length of rotation or of the rate of interest which shall be taken as a basis of calculation. These are matters about which no one can safely dogmatise in advance, and that is all that can safely be said about it.

The reader will perhaps then return to the position that in promoting national safety, in developing our own resources, in assisting agriculture, a forward national forestry policy is highly desirable. It is when we come to ways and means that controversy begins. It will, however, be generally agreed that if anything at all effective is to be done, the State must give the lead, and a big lead. Wherever land can be purchased or rented fairly cheaply, and timber growing is the best use to which it can be put, and there are reasonable possibilities of transport to our large industrial centres, there should be groups of State forests. These areas include several different parts of Scotland, the Cumberland and Westmorland district of England, Mid Wales, South Wales, Dartmoor and Exmoor, and perhaps parts of the eastern and southern counties. In these districts, therefore, we may expect that a Central Forest Authority will get to work on a considerable scale, keeping, no doubt, in the closest touch with the Boards of Agriculture as to utilisation of land which can be profitably cultivated and as to economic settlement of the men working in the forests. So far so good. Should there also be different forms of assistance to private owners who are willing to supplement the direct effort of the State by undertaking correct systems of forestry on their estates? This assistance can take several forms:—Advice, help in dealing with the vexed questions of railway rates, rating, taxation, and rabbits; proceeds-sharing schemes; and direct grants for afforestation and replanting. Judgment may be assisted by a word or two about some of them. Proceeds-sharing schemes have been vaguely adumbrated for some time, and it has recently been an extremely interesting task to work them out in the concrete. It has been found that workable schemes can be offered in either of two forms. Either the State and the land-owner can share all outgoings equally from the time that planting is begun, and divide equally the net proceeds when they accrue, or the State can pay for the original planting, and the owner can provide the land and the cost of maintaining the crop. Both schemes carry with them the advantage that both parties would have during the whole period of the rotation a direct incentive to make the scheme work smoothly and profitably. This is specially important in cases in which the land to be afforested is much intermixed with other

land belonging to the same owner, and it is probable therefore that it will be in these cases that proceeds-sharing schemes will be found to be most applicable. Direct grants, up to a maximum of £2 an acre for every acre correctly planted on an approved working plan, have been proposed in cases where the area is sufficient to make a reasonable contribution to timber supply, and where the owner is willing to covenant to keep the woods under correct conditions of silviculture until the crop is of some reasonable value as timber. The proposal will not be approved by those who think of land-owners as bloated capitalists, with pockets bulging with the profits which they have made from war sales of timber. To them it will seem that owners will naturally and normally replant, and that therefore the State need not help. To them, however, it may be suggested that war timber prices have hardly ever given a 5 per cent. return on costs, that the replanting of felled areas was becoming less and less common before the war owing to increasing burdens on land, and that land owners, who form one of the very few classes which have had no chance of increasing their incomes during the war to meet heavy all-round increases of expenditure, are in no position to do anything else with their timber money than put it aside to pay extra tithe taxation and death-duties, also to expect a man to plant is to ask him to do something which normally can bring no profit to the planter, and something about which it is utterly uncertain whether there will be profit or loss to his successors—should the State allow them to inherit. The writer must confess that in these circumstances he believes that to the extent to which the small grant which may be offered is taken, and therefore leads, as it would, to correct forestry methods becoming an established tradition on private estates, it will have been money well spent. He fears that the private owner will generally regard the sum of £2 an acre merely as enough to pay a fraction of the increased cost of planting brought about by the war, or to replace the grazing rental of his land for perhaps eight years, or about half the period during which his woods will be utterly unproductive of returns. He anticipates, therefore, that few owners will be willing to take the small assistance which may be offered when they consider the covenants and restrictions which must accompany it.

The last question which will be considered in this article is whether the State's forestry work should be done by a single authority for the United Kingdom, or by Forestry Branches of the three Departments of Agriculture. The Reconstruction Sub-committee, on which were the officers of the three departments who were in charge of forestry, and the Chairman of the Development Commission strongly recommended a single authority. But this proposal unfortunately takes the form to certain Scots of a plan to remove to Whitehall something which has hitherto been done from Edinburgh, and therefore of a retrograde step in their campaign for Scottish Home Rule.

It is worth while to state the facts upon this matter, for it is just the sort of question that might lead to the shipwreck of forestry's fair prospects, for which none would ultimately be more sorry than those who had primarily been responsible. First, it must unfortu-

nately be recognised that the administration of forestry has not gone well in Scotland in the past. The Board of Agriculture has not felt able to treat it as a serious responsibility. The actions and schemes of the Development Commission have somehow become encompassed by an atmosphere of dispute and suspicion. The only hope of that cordial co-operation of all concerned without which no paper schemes can succeed seems to lie in a complete break with the past. Secondly, the new start which is so necessary in Scotland will really give to Scots far more control of Scottish forestry than they have hitherto had. What little has been done for forestry has not really been done by the Board of Agriculture, but by the Development Commission, so that in fact there is no question of removing to London something which has hitherto been directed from Edinburgh. The Forest Authority to be established will undoubtedly have a far more active and experienced representation of Scots upon it than any body has hitherto had which has been concerned with forestry. The whole of their administrative and executive work is to be carried out, as it is now being carried out under the Interim Authority, by a wholly Scottish body sitting in Edinburgh. There will be set up by statute a most representative Consultative Committee for Scotland, also wholly Scottish. And it seems likely that the Central Authority itself will probably meet quite as often in Scotland as in England. Thirdly, the financial aspect of the case must be appreciated. If Scotland wishes to grow timber for the United Kingdom, clearly it must consent to allow general policy to be framed by an authority representing the United Kingdom. If Scotland wishes to be left alone to settle its forestry policy, it must be on the claim that Scotland should be considered an independent unit both for production and supply. On this basis, the amount to be devoted to forestry would be split up, and Scotland would receive an "equivalent grant" on the accepted basis that Scotland receives eleven ninety-firsts of the total amount available for Great Britain. If, as has been suggested $3\frac{1}{2}$ millions are to be voted for forestry work for the next ten years, and we allow, say, half a million for Ireland, Scotland would therefore be allowed £362,000. The Interim Authority has already come to the conclusion that if the funds remain under central control, at least half should be spent in Scotland. So the loss to Scotland if forestry is to be run by a branch of the Scottish Board of Agriculture would be over one and a-third millions, for the first ten-year period. It is not necessary to comment on this, but it may be added that so well is the general position appreciated in Scotland that, in spite of the strong national sentiment which inspires every Scot, every Scottish body which knows or cares about forestry is keenly in favour of setting up a strong central authority. In these circumstances the writer cannot believe that the proposals which may be put before Parliament will be jeopardised by an assertion of the principle of Scottish Home Rule. It cannot really help this cause in the long run that the future of Scottish forestry should be sacrificed to it. At any rate, if difficulties were to be put in the way of the bill, it would hardly attract to the national cause the Scottish

foresters who have for years watched the failure of a divided administration, under a scheme in which the Development Commission has held the purse strings without any audible protest from Scottish members of Parliament.

If it could be realised that forestry is a highly scientific service, with which steady progress is essential in the interests of national defence, it would be incredible that it should be split up among several authorities and therefore made ancillary to agriculture. We do not think of dividing up the administration of our Navy, for we realise that a single department must be made responsible for carrying out a complete defence programme. It is just as important in the interests of national safety that there should be single responsibility for the necessary programme of afforestation, so that no one should be able to say if we were found fatally lacking in timber in a future emergency that it was someone else's fault. The argument is the same if forestry is regarded as a scientific service, as it undoubtedly is. We do not propose to split up medical research, even when we are setting up separate Ministries of Health. Quite recently also, a new department has been started for investigating the costs of agricultural operations, which, as a highly scientific service, is to be administered on a uniform basis for the whole of the United Kingdom.

So for forestry many of its most needed developments wait upon its establishment as other scientific and technical services are established. For instance, we greatly need a big Imperial scheme of research, both as regards the growing of trees and the utilisation of timber, so worked out that all our best equipped universities and the Imperial College of Science and Technology will take part in a carefully co-ordinated whole. We greatly need a central information bureau upon forestry and timber questions, which can only be obtained if a central authority will set itself to collect information from our dominions and from foreign countries, and to make it available in a series of publications. Needless to say, no department of any Board of Agriculture has ever undertaken these most important branches of work, or will ever do so if forestry remains scattered among them. Preparations for this work are, however, already being made by the Interim Forest Authority.

The central fact is that a service such as forestry, in which you cannot afford to make mistakes, and in which if you do make mistakes you cannot correct them for forty or fifty years, must necessarily be so conducted that all the best experience is available at one centre, round which a forestry tradition will gradually grow up which will guide and inspire every branch of administration. The contrast in this and other respects between forestry and agriculture is very marked. Agriculture has its tradition well and widely understood, forestry practically has none. Agriculture is so large an industry that State service in it, even if split up among three or four departments, provides a career in which a good man will have adequate chances of promotion. If forestry is to attract the best men, there must be a single service, having a staff which is trained on the best methods that can be offered in the whole of the United Kingdom, and a common avenue of promotion. English and

Scottish agriculture have little to offer or to teach to one another. But in forestry each part of the United Kingdom has much to give the others. England has the best equipped demonstration area, Wales the most suitable districts for planting in close connection with timber-consuming districts, Scotland the largest stretches of cheap and suitable land. Ireland has plenty of waste land, and if it has little to offer besides save enthusiasm, has this very abundantly. Lastly, with agriculture the goal is always well in sight. The effect of State action or advice is generally apparent within a year, or at furthest at the end of a rotation; but with forestry it is always the long seventy-year view that must be taken. And it has been found by long and sad experience that if both are administered by the same department, the distant interest is always sacrificed to that which is immediately apparent. It is suggested, therefore, that it was a sound recommendation of the Reconstruction Committee that there should be a central authority for forestry, carried on in the most intimate connection with the departments of agriculture, but separate from them. Much would have been gained even if the service were centralised only for ten years, which is probably the limit of the period to which the promised Forestry Bill will relate, and the position were afterwards reconsidered. By that time something in the way of a tradition will have been established, and methods will have been worked out for reconciling the "seventy-year look," which is so important in forestry, with the immediate interests of agriculture.

On the whole, if argument is to weigh in these matters, the prospects of a successful start for State Forestry on broad lines seem bright. The Prime Minister also made much of it during the election. The War Cabinet made a very thorough investigation of the question, and are deeply pledged to support the main lines of the Reconstruction Sub-committee's report. Parliament is fully conscious of the pressing urgency of dealing comprehensively with all questions affecting national safety. It is a time when all friends of forestry, of agriculture, and of sound schemes of land settlement should unite to give the Forestry Bill a safe passage to the Statute Book.

F. D. ACLAND.

A NEW LIBERAL PROGRAMME: LIBERALISM AND LABOUR.

THE situation for the Liberal Party is a very serious one. The last election even if it did not break it into fragments did so seriously destroy its power that it may be a long time before it recovers from the effect of the shock. On the one hand you have an enormously reinforced Unionist Party in the House of Commons with every vested interest well represented, on the other you have a growing disposition on the part of the electors to support the Labour Party which would be much more satisfactorily represented in Parliament if either the Alternative Vote or Proportional Representation had been in existence. The Liberal Party has always prided itself on taking the middle course in politics, but a *via media* to-day may lead nowhere except to dissolution and the grave. It is perhaps not an exaggeration to say that both the Unionist Party and the Labour Party would be glad to see the Liberal cause safely buried out of sight. The Labour Party feel that the Progressive and Radical element in Liberalism has prevented them from achieving a full measure of success because for some years past it has stopped a large number of the electorate from joining the Labour ranks.

We do not propose to enter into a discussion of this question, our object is rather to show that if the Liberal Party is to live it must have a definite policy, a *raison d'être*. That policy must contain within it some constructive principle, some workable theory of the modern State. It must be more than a patchwork of opportunisms devised as the occasion requires to conciliate various sections of the people. It must certainly be something more than an appeal to the middle classes. When the whole world is in chaos you cannot create or recreate a cosmos by merely remedying superficial defects. The habit of tinkering has often been deprecated, sometimes unjustly. It may have great value on occasions, especially when a big scheme of reconstruction has been undertaken which requires amendment and improvement, but tinkering to-day will not meet the needs of the situation, and, to use an American colloquialism, "does not cut ice." If Liberals have any faith whatever in the progressive principles which they have upheld for so many generations they must be prepared to declare themselves in favour of the socialisation of industry so far as our own country is concerned and on the international plane they must work with urgent insistence for a commonwealth of nations. World unrest and national unrest go together. We shall never get social peace at home while the nations of Europe are in effect still at war. An international programme which takes it for granted that war in any form is necessary is no programme for the Liberal Party. We believe that just as arbitration should take the place of military force, so the peaceful interchange of goods does not require the declaration of commercial warfare for which so many members of the present Government stand. The prosperity of one nation does

not imply the ruin of another. The two may prosper side by side, and it should be to the mutual advantage of both that each should develop its own material resources. Provided that such development is free from the evils of low wages, long hours, and bad conditions of labour, there can be no conceivable objection to the successful trading of other nations.

To return, however, to the problem that confronts the Liberal Party. What is our answer to the unrest and the unsettlement in the ranks of labour that we witness to-day? Are we to press for social reforms which will merely "film the ulcerous sore," or shall we demand some more drastic remedy which will remove the cause of the suffering, for example, such a measure of control over industry as will enable the worker to reap the full reward of his labour? We take it for granted that an integral part of any Liberal programme in the future will be the enforcement of what has been called a national minimum, a standard of wages, of hours of labour, of education and health below which no one is allowed to sink. Side by side there must be a "Right to work" measure that will give security against unemployment. Such a measure will be difficult to devise, but men and women will no longer consent to be at the mercy of the law of supply and demand in the labour market. Whatever legislation is required to enable such a standard to be set up must be forthcoming, and there is special need for its application at a time when millions of soldiers are being released from active service and when millions of workers are being transferred from one industry to another. For any party that is worth preserving such a programme is non-debatable. We may differ as to methods, but as to the object in view there can be no difference of opinion. Side by side with such a minimum standard will march a large body of social reforms which will tend to mitigate the unavoidable suffering and hardship in a world where competition plays so large a part. We need only instance two or three such reforms as are implied by the increase in the amount of the old-age pensions and a lowering of the age, pensions for widows and the blind as well as pensions for the soldiers who have been maimed in the war and the extension of employment insurance to all trades.

The acid test of Liberalism is, however, the attitude taken up with regard to the question which is vexing the minds of all thoughtful men to-day, viz., the desirability or otherwise of nationalising the railways, the mines, the canals, and the means of transport. The demand of Labour is that all great monopolies should be controlled by the State, and that the profits, if profits are required, should go to the National Exchequer and serve the purpose of reducing general taxation. The first step is doubtless a full inquiry, but even if such an inquiry should reveal defects in national control and State management, it does not follow that the experiment ought not to be made. It is not so much a matter of expediency or calculation, as of justice and principle. The figures which the Coal Inquiry brought to light on the very first day were significant. It was admitted that a rise in the price of coal of 2s. 6d. per ton which the Government sanctioned without full inquiry cost the consumers £25,000,000, and it was also admitted that

£5,000,000 of this money went to coal proprietors who were already making huge profits. As a matter of fact almost everybody knew beforehand that some proprietors were either making very small profits or losing on their mines, while in other cases the very reverse was happening. In itself this is a sufficient proof of the desirability of nationalisation. The Trade Unions emphasise the justice of nationalisation: "Labour," they say, "will never be contented and ought not to be contented while huge profits are being made by a few individuals out of a national monopoly, and the first step in the socialisation of industry must be the taking over of these monopolies by the State."

This war has impoverished a very large number of people, but it has immensely increased the wealth of certain individuals. The average elector does not like to hear that a man who only paid £500 a year in income tax before the war has made nearly £1,000,000 in four years. It is these inequalities that create the spirit of revolution. Yet it is not so much the fault of the man who made the money as of the Government that allowed him to make it, and if we interpret aright the feeling of Labour Conferences and of Trade Unionists generally this sort of thing must come to an end. It cannot end unless we definitely adopt the collectivist principle in dealing with these great industries upon which the very life of the nation depends.

"Organised labour throughout the wide range of industry," says *The Times*, "is either moving or prepared to move along the regular lines of trade union action towards a permanent betterment of the individual life and status of the wage earner." The men who have come back from the war not less than the men who have remained at home are profoundly impressed by the fact that while hundreds of thousands in the nation have been sacrificing their lives, or risking all that they possess, some, at least, in the nation have been utilising the opportunity to raise prices and to make huge profits. The result is that they are determined to compel any Government that refuses to right this essential wrong to take action. They go further, they denounce the whole structure of competitive commercialism. They challenge the old economic order, which is changing or passing away, and the nation for its own sake must respond to the challenge. We are constantly being told that it is impossible to pay the huge debt accumulated by this war without a great increase in production, and we are told at the same time that the right course for the workers to adopt is to be willing to work long hours for a reduced wage in order to set the country on its feet once more. The answer of Labour is that if the principle of "equality of sacrifice" had been observed throughout the war the Government would have had a claim upon Labour that could not be denied, but the Government did little or nothing to enforce equality of sacrifice. It either openly sanctioned the exploitation of the people, or it tacitly consented to a shameless system of profiteering. Labour contends that there must be a scientific re-organisation of the nation's industry on the basis of common ownership, and in face of the flagrant inequalities in the distribution of wealth, it seems that the only course open to the Liberal Party

is to press for such a system of administration and control of the big monopolies as will afford no opportunity for private profit.

The advantage that would accrue from the nationalisation of the mines is obvious. Coal is the raw material of all our industries. Factories and workshops must close their gates if coal be withdrawn. The railways could not run, and all the electrical power stations would have to shut down. Seeing that the mines and the railways are so closely united it would be absurd to nationalise the railways without, at the same time, nationalising the mines upon which the railways depend. If eventually the railways are electrified, you will still need coal to raise the steam for the dynamos, and the conservation of coal and the right use of the limited amount that we possess in the United Kingdom is of the first consequence. The Coal Inquiry has shown that you cannot run your poorer mines except at a loss under present conditions, and that the only way in which we can produce all the coal that we require is to pool the mines, the good with the bad. While some proprietors were taking immense profits, others were losing money, or would have lost money but for the subsidy of the Government. Once the mines are nationalised, we can then deal with the question of wages and hours for the million men employed with a full knowledge of the situation. Justice can be shown to every class of labour in mines and the product of that labour can be sold at a fixed price in every part of the country. Railways, canals, harbours, and roads should also be nationalised. In this way it would be possible to work out a co-ordinated and unified system of communication and transport. It is not merely a question of profits going to shareholders and directors, to privately owned companies (although the railway workers strongly object to making profits except for the State), but there is also the question of economies which can be effected by unification. We have had state control of the railways and canals during the war, but we must carry this control a step further. After fair compensation has been paid to all the financial interests involved and the railways are completely in the hands of the State, it would be possible to undertake many big schemes that have been long delayed. Side by side with the improvement in the main lines of communication would go the development of light railways, tramways, roads, and service of public vehicles. The effect that this would have upon the commercial and social life of the people it is almost impossible to estimate, but to agriculture alone the nationalisation of the railways and an adequate system of transport would give an immense stimulus. It must always be understood that as regards both the mines and the railways, the workers would require a large measure of control and voice in the management. Bureaucracy is anathema to them.

To deal adequately with the nationalisation of the big monopolies would require a drastic revision of the land laws of this country. The laws relating to land have been handed down to us from the time when the landlords were supreme in both Houses of Parliament. They naturally legislated in their own interest. It is something more than a tradition, it is an ingrained habit of the English people to regard the landlord as essential. There is a

growing tendency, however, on the part of all who desire genuine reforms to urge that as the land lies at the root of these big monopolies that problem must engage our attention first of all. We may readily admit that there are many landlords whose one object is to secure that the land of the country is put to the very best possible use. They are generous and considerate in their dealings with those whom they employ and deeply concerned about the future. In the majority of cases, without condemning those who profit largely by the present system of private ownership, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that you cannot satisfactorily deal with any big question that requires the use of land whether it is mines, or railways, or housing, or agriculture without entrenching upon the position of the landlord. The question which men everywhere are asking to-day is what should go to the individual, and what should go to the State. What, for example, is the value that attaches to land by the growth of the community? You cannot increase land in quantity except by land reclamation on the coast, and even there the private landlord is in control.

Everywhere we see illustrations of how land of comparatively little value, apart from the increase in population, has, by reason of that increase, been swollen in price and made inaccessible to the mass of the people. There was a time when the value of the land which is now the site of the City of London was comparatively small, but it has been sold in exceptional cases at the rate of some £4,000,000 per acre. Rosyth is a good illustration of how land of comparatively little value, but required by the nation for some specific purpose has suddenly advanced in price to an almost inconceivable extent. The matter does not require to be argued to-day, the only question that does require to be argued is how far the State is justified in taking over the land for essentially national purposes, and failing nationalisation how far it is entitled to tax the landowner for the monopoly which he possesses and for the increment in value which now goes into his pockets. Arnold Toynbee used to say that there were two cases in which he would allow the collectivist principle to operate. The *first* was when the individual finds it impossible to supply for himself something that is a vital need, then the State must supply it for him. The *second*, which may be regarded as its corollary, was that where the individual is in possession of something which in the interest of the community as a whole should belong to the State there the State should step in and claim ownership. As an instance of the former principle, we have the municipalisation of water, gas, and electricity, and the State ownership of the postal and telegraph services. As an instance of the latter we venture to put forward the claim of the State to the ownership of the railways, mines, means of transport, and finally of land.

At the moment we see a demand for houses which is quite unprecedented. The Government is committed to a policy which would subsidise the local authorities in building anything from 300,000 to 500,000 houses in England alone. One of the hindrances operating to delay this programme is the question of acquiring the land. It ought to be possible without delay to commandeer what-

ever land is required the moment it is required. Under present circumstances arbitration will have to be resorted to, and even if housing is not unduly delayed it is to be feared that prices will mount by leaps and bounds, even without the 10 per cent. for compulsory purchase, which is now to disappear. In the same way with the land that is required for the settlement of soldiers who wish to follow agriculture, how is the land to be obtained under the present system? It will have to be commandeered if the large demand is to be satisfied in good time. Apart from nationalisation there is only one way in which the problem can be satisfactorily dealt with and that is by taxation. The private ownership of land enables the landlord to take the whole of the communal value of any piece of land. He may do nothing whatever in return, and the betterment may be the result of action taken by the community on other land in the neighbourhood, but it does send up the value of his own land, and the claim is that he ought to be taxed on its communal value. Any labour which he expended upon it himself would be rewarded by an adequate return, but any increase in value not due to his own efforts should be taxed. It is unfortunate that the valuation of the land of the country has not been completed. Even if we could determine the present value of land upon an equitable basis it would be a great advantage. The landlord should then pay rates and taxes upon that value, and if he were unwilling so to do it should be open to the municipality or to the nation to purchase at that price. We know, for example, that about 3,600,000 acres of land in Scotland are held for sporting purposes. There may be little value in this land, but whatever value there is should be regarded as the basis of taxation, and if there is a demand for any of this land for other useful purposes the landlord should not be at liberty to withhold it from such use.

Now that the Government has decided upon its housing scheme, there is nothing to be done but to await results. The local authorities, knowing that they will not have to incur a loss that would exceed a 1d. rate, and knowing also that the Government will make up the deficit, may be induced to build; but there will doubtless be many cases in which action is long delayed, and in that case the Government will have to be prepared to fill the gap and supply the necessary housing accommodation. It cannot build on its own account, but it can pay others to build for it, and it may be the only way to speed up recalcitrant local authorities. No building on a large scale should be allowed without town planning. In fact, town planning schemes should be insisted upon as an immediate necessity, and the land around London and all the large industrial centres should be planned so that we may know beforehand the purpose for which it is intended. In the town planning schemes it should be impossible for more than eight or ten houses to be built upon any given acre of land, and provision should be made for large gardens to take the place of allotments, together with special playgrounds for the children.

We are constantly being told that in order to pay off the heavy debt incurred by this war we must increase our production. An increase of production is necessary from every point of view. If

you are to have a high standard of life, a national minimum of health and education, housing and wages, your industries must be successful and both your internal and overseas trade must be constantly increasing. The Liberal Party will always be against tariffs because they raise the cost of living and allow profits to be made at the expense of the consumer, who after all is the average citizen. Tariffs such as any Government to-day would dare to impose would only tax manufactured articles, exempting food stuffs and raw materials. That would not provide a very large sum of money, and for such a small revenue it would be hardly worth while to penalise the consumer and perhaps penalise both your import and export trade. Liberalism stands for Free Trade, but should not regard it as a shibboleth. Free Trade did undoubtedly enable the United Kingdom to finance the war, and indirectly it was due to Free Trade that we had an enormous mercantile marine, which saved us from disaster at a very critical time in the war.

There are two questions, however, which impinge upon the subject of Free Trade and must be considered. One is the question of "key" industries, and the other the importation of sweated goods. With regard to the latter, all that needs to be said is that it is impossible to define accurately what is meant by the term "sweated" until you have fixed your international standard which will deal with wages, hours of labour, and conditions generally. Anything that sinks below the standard set up by an International Labour Parliament should come in for the severest scrutiny, and goods that are clearly produced by sweated labour, whether on the Continent or in any other part of the world, would have to be prohibited. To tax would be a mistake. In such a case it is far better to have rigid exclusion. However, this is a matter upon which Labour will speak with no uncertain voice as soon as the labour organisations are able to get together and legislate. The other point concerns what have been called "key" industries. It is an undoubted fact that during the war we discovered that we had been far too dependent upon other countries, and especially Germany and Austria, for certain essentials of industry. The two illustrations generally quoted of these particular industries are, first, aniline dyes and the chemical products of coal tar, and secondly, optical glass. Other illustrations could be given, but these two will suffice for our purpose. Great headway has, no doubt, been made with regard to the manufacture of aniline dyes in this country, but there is every reason to believe that British manufacturers cannot at the moment compete with Germany, and the question is whether the Government under these circumstances should enable the producers, by means of heavy subsidies, to keep open their factories and consolidate their position in order to compete against foreign imports, and, if that assistance is given, how long should it last? The Government has already granted help to the aniline dye industry, and it is useless to go back on the past, but the question that has to be decided is whether it would not be better and wiser in the interests of the community as a whole, for the Government frankly to take over these industries and maintain them against all comers, prohibiting wherever necessary the entrance of foreign goods, and using profits to lighten the burden that rests upon the taxpayer.

The Liberal Party must also be prepared to pronounce an opinion on the questions involved in the disposal of our large national factories which were built for munition purposes, and also in regard to the national shipyards and the national ships. Whatever may be the opinion of shipowners, the country did not want to see the shipyards and ships constructed at Government expense handed back again to private control. Surely a sound Liberal policy would take us even a step further. We are always discussing the importance of bringing the Dominions overseas into closer contact with the Motherland, and many schemes have been devised which enable colonial statesmen to share with us the government of the Empire as a whole and play a part in great imperial matters. Could there be anything more likely to bring together the whole of the British Commonwealth, to enable it to feel its unity and sense of oneness, than lines of imperial steamships owned by the United Kingdom and in touch with every part of the world, competing with the private steamship companies only where necessary, opening up new routes, new sources of wealth, and making it possible even for the remotest Dominions to feel that they were not forgotten or overlooked? At one time this would have been described as "collectivism gone mad," but the war has conclusively proved that, but for complete Government control, which was equivalent to ownership at the time, we should have fared very badly during this war at the hands of private steamship companies.

The time has come for the Liberal Party, following the formation of a League of Nations, to surrender the old methods of secret diplomacy, which have been such a fruitful cause of misunderstandings and wars in the past. We must trust more to publicity in our foreign relations. Having emerged from this world war as the victors, there is no reason why we should cultivate secret alliances or make secret treaties. We are hoping that all the Great Powers of the world will eventually be drawn into the League of Nations, and that being so, the settlement of the questions affecting these nations can be discussed in the presence of all the peoples. "There ought," said Lord Bryce, speaking of our statesmen representing us in other countries, "to be a public opinion of our people to watch and to direct their courses, and even to check their courses if it should seem to drift from the general principles which animate the nation as a whole." He points out that Parliament has frequently found itself confronted with a "fait accompli," and that it had no power to exercise a constant and direct control over the management of our foreign relations. Both Houses of Parliament must be supplied with the necessary facts and keep "au fait" with all the data required, geographical, historical, economic, and social, which determine the policy of each of the great countries and of the various parties in those countries. If this is carried out there is every hope that public opinion, resting upon more adequate knowledge, will enable us to avoid many quarrels or sources of disquiet between nation and nation.

PERCY ALDEN.

PRESIDENT WILSON, IN EUROPE AND AMERICA.

IN the measureless confusion and agony of Europe one thing is certain, if anything at all can in these hours be so described.

It is that, within a few days of the present pages appearing in print, the Conference of the Powers in Paris will have reached decisions upon a number of momentous matters; and that the world will be learning whether, or in what degree, the proclamation of those decisions is likely to prelude the return of peace and normal living. As the world recognises, their character and force depend to a great extent upon the President of the United States, whose presence in Paris is of simply incalculable moment.

It would be precisely accurate to say that in modern history no parallel could be found to the position of Mr. Wilson as a leader of the nations. In December, when he came to Europe, there was enough of misgiving and of scepticism in the Foreign Offices and among the governing interests representing the old order of things. There was none whatever among the peoples themselves. The Italian newspaper which affirmed that the arrival of President Wilson meant that the hour of justice had struck was expressing the feeling of the multitudes. Everywhere throughout Europe it was simply taken for granted that Mr. Wilson stood for the whole of the United States, the one great nation unexhausted by the war: that in his utterances was heard the voice of all America, and that when he spoke of a peace of justice and healing and of a settlement embodied in a new international order, he was uttering the word which, above all others, the American people wished to have spoken on their behalf. Not that even the least instructed among us looked upon the League of Nations as an American invention, worked out since 1914; but Europe had come to believe that America stood by the League as the one possible guarantee of the treaty of peace. This was the distinctive American contribution; accordingly, Mr. Wilson's weight in the counsels of the nations was to be estimated in direct relation thereto. The American purpose, in a word, was summed up in Woodrow Wilson. There was no fact of the Paris Conference which seemed clearer than this; none to which the plenipotentiaries had so immediately to adjust themselves.

Now it is plain that nothing in the international crisis can be more important than the policy of the United States, the feeling of its people, and the character of their relation to the President. These things are not by any means fully understood in England; yet the certainly must be understood if the world is to emerge at all.

Mr. Wilson's opponents have always contended that from the outset he mistook alike the issues of the war and the spirit of the American public. This has, of course, been the view especially of conservative Republicans in the Eastern States and all those others who held that the United States ought to have been earlier in the war. True, the President said some things in 1914 and 1915 which seemed to imply a certain imperfection of vision as regards Europe; but in the light of after events, the accusation that he did not

understand the general mind of his country seems to be wholly baseless. After April, 1917, many of his most prominent political opponents admitted that the course of his policy had been right, and that the moment of his decision was also right. As for those great numbers of Americans who had been unconvinced as to the wisdom of America's intervention, they felt that the President had exhausted every means of keeping out with honour, and in consequence they stood solidly behind him. For a year or more after this, Mr. Wilson represented the nation as completely as he dominated Congress. His statement of the issues in speeches and messages, with their insistence upon the higher aims of the conflict, were an immense force in stimulating the national effort. They satisfied the serious American, and to all men and women filling places of responsibility they were a continuous inspiration. It may well be doubted whether at any time since the United States became a nation, any President has stood in a position of more unchallenged authority and prestige than did Mr. Wilson from the spring of 1917 to the summer of 1918.

It was during the months of intensified war activity that observers in America noted the development of a significant change. The second half of the year 1918, covering the great combined offensive, the armistice, the congressional elections, and the opening of the Paris Conference, brought Mr. Wilson very near to disaster. The forces at work were innumerable, but those that counted most are not difficult to summarise. First, as we should expect, came the inevitable assaults upon the policy of the Government in its conduct of the war. The President had made no changes in his Administration when entering upon his second term, one month after the diplomatic break with Germany. The Cabinet contained several men of high ability; but no one of these could be described as a national figure, and two or three were continuously and unmercifully attacked. This was the case especially with the Secretary for the Navy and the Secretary for War. Mr. Daniels so managed the administration of the Fleet that the Press came round to his side in the first twelve months, but it is curious that Mr. Newton Baker—in some ways the ablest of Mr. Wilson's lieutenants, did not succeed in overcoming his assailants, even after he had carried through a two-fold task of administration certainly never excelled—the smooth establishment of compulsory military service and the transport of a huge American army overseas. Moreover, the inevitable failures and scandals of war administration began early and assumed somewhat terrifying shapes, as, for example, in the indictment of the shipyards, the exposure of colossal waste in the air service, and the constant bickering between the new departments concerned with war industries and trade. Big business was united in a vast alliance against the constant extensions of Government control and the new enterprises in wartime taxation, while Mr. McAdoo's handling of the railroads, coming after a spell of grave mismanagement by the companies synchronised with the terrors of the severest winter in half a century. The hardships of the fuel control and the food shortage, the fixed price of wheat and the Government's refusal to fix the

price of cotton, the multitudinous and unavoidable personal and class grievances that accompany every military system—all these and a thousand other circumstances combined to bring discredit upon the Wilson Administration, just at the stage when it was in need of all the public support it could secure.

We are all by this time familiar with the unpopularity of a war Government, whatever its character and leadership. But to the trials of the Wilson administration must undoubtedly be added the fact that throughout it has remained of one political colour. A coalition government, though often enough suggested, was never seriously considered in Washington, and Mr. Wilson was assailed because, as his opponents said, he had kept to the party principle in choosing expert advisers and administrative heads. The charge was not difficult to meet. Politics had nothing to do with the appointment of such men as Mr. Hoover in the food control, Mr. Schwab and Mr. Hurley in shipping, Mr. Baruch and Mr. Stettinus in the department of war industries; while by entrusting the inquiry into the air service scandals to Mr. Charles E. Hughes, his opponent in the last Presidential election, Mr. Wilson accomplished a brilliant stroke at the expense of his enemies.

But it was impossible for the President, being a party leader, to protect himself. The Republican attack, held in check during the opening months of war activity, has been in full cry since last summer, and with the November elections it became open and uncontrolled. A party truce is possible within limits under a coalition government. It is not possible when the government retains its party character, still less if a national election intervenes and is fought upon straight party lines. The elections fell upon November 5th, exactly a month after the first German call for an armistice, and during the week when the acceptance by Germany of the Allies' terms was being hour by hour expected. It was in these circumstances that Mr. Wilson took a step which, in the eyes of both friends and opponents, was condemned as almost the only serious tactical blunder of which he has been guilty since his coming into national politics. Presumably the party managers were telling the President that the election outlook was very bad for the Democrats. Their antagonists were naturally making the fullest use of the war situation and the war temper. Mr. Roosevelt, whose desperate physical condition was still unknown to the general public, had recovered his place as Republican leader, and had rallied the anti-Wilson forces throughout the country. It was idle to pretend that there was a party truce amid the then unlimited activities of the Republicans, encouraged by the anti-Wilson Democrats. The President accepted the logic of the situation, and issued to his supporters an appeal which was seized upon and exploited to the limit. It laid stress upon the absolute need of the Government's receiving a vote of confidence in the extremely critical stage at which the world then stood. Mr. Wilson reminded the country that the Administration was Democratic, and asked for a majority in both Houses which could be depended upon to support him. This was the least Wilsonian paper to which the President had ever put his hand. It had hardly a touch of the great accent to

which he has accustomed the American people. The Republicans took it as a formal ending to the party truce, which had in effect been broken months before. They denounced it as an outrageous piece of partisanship, and interpreted it as implying that in the President's view, patriotism was restricted to support of the Democratic party. This of course was a plain perversion; but it is easy to see how an infelicitous political document could, in the tense atmosphere of last autumn, be played upon to the injury of its author. The move was to a large extent successful. The new Congress, to be called in special session some time before June, is Republican, by a working majority in the House of Representatives and by the narrowest margin in the Senate.

There are several other matters to be explained if the President's position is to be understood. The powerful newspapers in the North and West are overwhelmingly Republican and anti-Wilson. In practically all the largest cities the Opposition commands the field, the situation being made all the more serious by reason of the tendency, greatly strengthened in recent years, towards monopolist control. In New York to-day the defence of the President is practically confined to one morning and one evening paper. In Chicago a single newspaper, bitterly anti-Wilson, divides the entire morning public with the organ of Mr. Hearst. Nor must we forget that, so long as America was actively at war, most of the pro-administration papers were so concerned to protect themselves against any possible charge of un-Americanism that they preferred to avoid the discussion of larger policies, and continuously struck the simple patriotic note.

Nor is this all. Few people in England are acquainted in any detail with the unlimited machinery of publicity, stimulus, and suggestion which was organised throughout the United States for whipping up the war-feeling, insuring national unity, and maintaining the popular interest in the incessant appeals for money. The country generally was expecting at least another twelve months of war. In 1918 there was developed an enormously intensified campaign—by newspaper, poster, and kinema, and by that purely American feature of the modern propagandist machine, the incessant four-minute speech in playhouse or at street corner. Hence, when all the evidence began pointing towards a speedy ending of the war, and when, amid the population remote from the war to which it was contributing in so marvellous a measure, there was need of full discussion upon the actualities of the armistice and the preliminary settlement, the articulate opinion of America ran strongly against the President. Never was a country less prepared for negotiations, or even for a suggestion of peace, than was the United States when Germany reached the hour of collapse.

The President had to meet the whole brunt of this situation. In his first reply to the German plea for an armistice, he had framed the brief note which brought the confession of utter defeat. I suppose that to the immense majority of observers among the suffering peoples of Europe, the renowned three questions of October came as the opening crash of a world drama, big with hope for mankind. But, through the medium of a thousand cartoons and

leading articles, and headlines without end, Mr. Wilson was told that the original plea should have been flung back with a simple demand for unconditional surrender. His opponents wore the button of extemporised Unconditional Surrender Clubs, and so completely was the military and diplomatic situation obscured by the press that probably nine-tenths of the protesting crowd were persuaded that it was their outcry which had decided the character of the later negotiations and made the terms of the armistice degrees more severe than they would have been if the President had been permitted to act alone. There is good reason for saying that the cry of Unconditional Surrender, and the fact that the Armistice was signed in the second week of November instead of during the opening days of the month, combined with the influenza epidemic and the partisan election appeal to bring about the relative defeat of Mr. Wilson at the polls.

A week or two later it was announced that the President had decided to attend the Peace Conference in person. It was immediately evident that the enterprise was widely unpopular. All precedent was against it; the most adventurous of Chief Executives hitherto had hardly dared to cross the border or take a coasting trip. Mr. Wilson heard a myriad blended notes informing him that the President's place was in the White House. The public as a whole did not understand how deeply the peoples of Europe, and especially our own people, desired Mr. Wilson's presence at the peace table. His own party was filled with misgiving. The Republicans (forgetting what would infallibly have been Mr. Roosevelt's course in like circumstances) were extraordinarily contemptuous and bitter, though Mr. Taft and a few other Opposition leaders supported him valiantly all through. An Englishman who remembers the animosity against Gladstone and Chamberlain, and recalls the more recent memory of Conservative England's hatred for Mr. Lloyd George before 1914, is tempted to say that President Wilson in 1918 was called upon to endure as much as any of those men in the way of personal and political hostility, although he has not as yet experienced anything to compare with the fury of scorn and hatred which was the portion of Lincoln, from his own side, during the Civil War.

It was, then, in such circumstances as these that President Wilson left for Europe—to be hailed in France, in England, and in Italy as the hope of the world. Two assumptions were made about him, and have been quite evidently shared by all the European peoples: first, that Mr. Wilson is, in international policy, the representative man of America; secondly, that the great policy with which his name has been associated—the incorporation in the peace treaty of a League of Nations covenant—is the distinctive American contribution to the settlement. Mainly because of these assumptions, Mr. Wilson's leadership in regard to the League has been accepted in Paris, although, as is well known, the draft covenant embodies the work largely of British international thinking. It is a long way from the best reached by that thinking, as it is also far behind the ideal scheme conceived by the President himself. We must, however, conclude that, imperfect as it is, it comes as the result of Mr.

Wilson's participation in the Paris deliberations. The alternative, which we have surely escaped, was that the victorious Allies should make straight for a pact of power and vengeance.

We have still, however, to consider the problem as it stands in America, now that the partial result of the Conference has been placed before the American public. When Mr. Wilson appeared in Paris the question was: Were the European Powers prepared to make any covenant at all for ensuring the peace of the world? To-day it is: Can Mr. Wilson carry opinion in his own country to the point of committing the United States to a place in the concert of Powers and the acceptance of the responsibility attaching to the decision?

If we were to attempt an answer to this question upon the basis of the news cabled from New York and Washington since the publication of the draft covenant, it would have to be unfavourable. But the mind of America is rarely reflected in the cables. The most formidable circumstance, of course, is the temper of a section of the Senate. Treaties cannot be made except with the concurrence of the Senate, and it must be recognised that the Senate as a body is angry with the President—for his method more than for his policy. The Senate is, by the Constitution, a co-ordinate authority with the Executive in foreign affairs, and it has been largely ignored by the President. Mr. Wilson, it is complained, has steadily played a lone hand, and has not consulted the Foreign Relations Committee. This, they say, is true of his policy both before and after the declaration of war; of the notes on submarine warfare, the break with Germany, the frequent statements of policy, the fourteen points, the negotiations of October, the composition of the Peace Delegation, the visits to Europe, and the entire range of speculation and decision relating to the League of Nations. Starting from a common basis of hostility, the senatorial criticism finds varied expression. Some members insist upon the old American detachment from Europe, confessing themselves as still moving within the scope of George Washington's warnings and the formula devised, with the approval and support of Canning, by President Monroe in 1823. Others, like Reed of Missouri, Borah of Idaho, and Sherman of Illinois, are shocked to see the United States being drawn into a scheme devised, as they contend, to further the power of the British Empire, agreeing to nominate only one member of council against eight appointed by America's rivals, and being constrained by an unholy covenant to dispatch a contingent of American soldiers, no longer free, to join an army of international mercenaries for the benefit of other Powers in the Balkans or in Central Asia. From such exponents of the American policy, a Senator like Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts, is very far. His hostility is not to *a* league, but to *this* league, and, while earnestly pressing for drastic amendment, Mr. Lodge insists that the making of peace is separate from, and must precede, the forming of any international covenant. This is the position also of almost all the prominent Republicans in the country, Mr. Taft and Dr. Lowell, the president of Harvard, being the most noteworthy exceptions. The fact must be plainly recognised: the managers of

the Republican party are acting upon the assumption that the control of affairs is soon to be in their hands; and they will break Mr. Wilson if they can.

But in the meantime, what has happened to the President's leadership of American opinion outside Congress? In regard to the international policy, it suffered last year inevitably from the absorption of the country in the business of war-making, from the fewness of the daily papers supporting a liberal foreign policy, and undoubtedly also from Mr. Wilson's partial failure, under the heavy burden of administration, to get his policy over to the people in general. The cessation of hostilities brought a noteworthy change, and Mr. Wilson's presence in Europe has naturally ensured that the progress of the settlement takes a leading place day by day in the news. But the President's brief return to America counts for far more than any other influences, and the central point in the changed situation is marked by the speech delivered in Boston on February 24th. That address, lofty in substance, yet familiar in tone, was a most skilful appeal to the mind and conscience of America. Mr. Wilson spoke of the anguish of the peoples in the Old World, the wonder of their realisation that the might of America and American manhood had been thrown without reserve into the cause of the Allied peoples, the widespread recognition that great ideals had wrought their magic, and then the madness of the thought that America having made one great adventure in the cause of civilisation could contemplate withdrawal into her former isolation. At the time of writing there is little direct evidence of the effect of this speech and the one delivered in New York on the eve of the return to Europe; but the English reader may be assured that together the two utterances have exercised a profound effect upon the national mind. We should remember, too, that since Mr. Wilson went to Paris, four months ago, the whole of America has been discussing the League of Nations. Perhaps at no time in the long political record of this country have the English people been so preoccupied with a single matter of policy as the American people are at this moment with the coming organisation of the world, and the place which America will be called upon to take in the maintenance of peace and the new order. Of course, it is recognised that for the American people to break with their past to the extent which full participation in the League implies, would be a momentous decision. Tradition in politics is an extremely hard thing to modify in the United States; but no country in the world is so quick at catching an idea as America is, and in no other is the mechanism of education developed as it is there. The world should be prepared to recognise that President Wilson may already have accomplished this wonderful thing, first, by consistently appealing, in defiance of almost every dominant influence in war time, to the finest and highest in the American people; secondly, by going to the Peace Conference armed with a noble conception; thirdly, by returning to his own people and saying to them with a plainness and sincerity to confound the sceptic and the politician: "The people of Europe bid me say, It is up to you!"

S. K. RATCLIFFE.

ALBANIA AT THE PEACE CONFERENCE.

AT a moment when the Allies have won a victory enabling them to reconstruct the world in almost any manner which may seem to them desirable, it is natural that their publics should be more or less divided into two great groups upon the question of terms which should be given to Germany and her associates. One of these groups believes that the best method of securing future peace is to carve up territory and to establish new frontiers, merely in accordance with the interests of the Allies as a whole, and with the aspirations of the various successful belligerents in particular. The other group considers, whilst Germany must be placed in a position in which she can never again disturb the world's tranquility, that the peace terms themselves must be sufficiently fair to constitute a guarantee against future wars, that the basis of nationalities must be observed, and that the interests of small nations are as sacred as those of the Great Powers. My purpose, however, here is not to discuss the merits of these respective points of view, but to show that, from either standpoint, even with the creation of a League of Nations, the position of Albania and the settlement of the Albanian question are vital if the world's future peace is to be assured.

From the purely material side geography and history prove the significance of Albania. That country occupies a position which makes it the natural means of entry into and exit from a large part of the western half of the Balkan Peninsula. Its northern part, containing Scutari, San Giovanni di Medua and Durazzo, is therefore coveted by the Serbs, who desire, by expansion in this direction, to secure free access to the sea, which access, with the defeat of Austria, should be provided by way of Bosnia, Herzegovina and Dalmatia, if not also by the union of Serbia and of Montenegro. Owing to its situation on the lower Adriatic, too, Albania practically commands the Straits of Otranto, and the government in power there can play a prominent part in the control of the Adriatic to which they lead. It is this which makes Italy particularly interested in the future of the Principality, and especially in that of its southern port, Valona. Greece on the other hand, animated largely by nationalistic motives, but also partly by a desire to secure the port of Santi Quaranta and its hinterland, thus gaining possession of the whole of the strategically important Corfu Channel, and becoming a force in the Adriatic, is endeavouring to extend her north-western frontier at the expense of Albania. Leaving out of account Austria—a country which happily can now be ignored—and passing over the claims of Bulgaria, which are neither far-reaching nor important to-day, this means that parts of Albania are still claimed by Serbia and Montenegro, or by a Serbo-Montenegro, parts by Greece, and parts by Italy, and that whilst the questions involved were nominally settled by the Ambassadorial Conference which created an autonomous principality in December, 1912, the whole future of Albania, still in the melting-pot, is bound up with rival interests perhaps

more numerous than those connected with any other question at present before the Peace Conference.

Turning to history, and referring only to events which have taken place during the last two decades, we find that, although the Albanians have not always realised in advance what would be the result of their actions, their attitude and their problems have, in fact, been responsible for many of the developments of the last few years. To begin with, whilst those concerned certainly did not understand its meaning, the Albanian Congress in session at Ferisovitch in July, 1908, was utilised by the Young Turks to make the demands which forced Abdul Hamid to grant the Constitution. After this change of régime, it was the Albanians who first showed resentment towards the policy of "Turkisation" immediately adopted by the Committee of Union and Progress, and who, by a series of revolutions, in almost continuous progress from 1908 to 1912, steadily worked for the establishment of autonomy. These revolutions in their turn really constituted the beginning of the end so far as the Young Turks were concerned. They proved to the neighbouring Balkan States that nothing could be accomplished in or with Turkey otherwise than by force, and, by the promises of Albanian autonomy in which they resulted, were at least in part responsible for the creation of the Balkan League, and therefore for the precipitation of the first Balkan War. Once more, whilst the Albanians were able to take no active part in the campaigns of 1912-13, the creation of the autonomous Albania, entirely justifiable on the nationality basis, was largely answerable for the second Balkan War, for the European crisis of 1913, and for the so-called Balkan settlement subsequently arrived at by the Treaty of Bucharest of August of that year. Again the situation in Albania brought about by the attitude of Europe and by the incompetence of Prince William of Wied continued, up to August, 1914, to be a danger to the world's peace. If these events mean anything at all, therefore, they signify that the present non-settlement or the mis-settlement of the Albanian question will keep alive embers which at any moment may burst into flames, and that even if sections of the population are allowed to be partially Slavised or Hellenised this would only entail the creation of a second Poland.

Turning to the aspects of the problem bound up with right and justice, we find that Sir Charles Eliot, Sir Edwin Pears, and Mr. H. N. Brailsford, who are perhaps the best British authorities on Balkan questions, all discuss in their books the early and distinct origin and the individuality of the Albanians. Although never recognised as a separate community by the Turks, their nationality has remained perfectly distinct. If proof of this statement be required it can be found in the continued revolutions caused by a desire to secure the recognition of their racial existence, in the preservation of their language, which probably formed the original speech of the people of large parts, if not the whole, of the Balkan Peninsula, and in the maintenance of their customs which date from time immemorial. These conditions, together with the fact that, as Sir Charles Eliot says, the Arnaut is an Arnaut, whether he

calls himself Catholic, Orthodox, or Moslem, constitute the indisputable reasons for which the claims of Albania are as entitled to consideration by the Paris Conference as are those of the remainder of the World's smaller nationalities.

The position of Albania in the Peace negotiations is unique. Left by the departure of Prince William of Wied in September, 1914, without even the vestige of a Central Government, and possessed of no organised forces, she has naturally been unable to take any active part against the enemy. On the other hand, so far as I am aware, no evidence worthy of the name has ever been produced to show that the attitude of the Albanians has been otherwise than sympathetic to the Allies—a friendly attitude proved by the presence of an Albanian contingent at Salonica, and, in an entirely different and perhaps lesser way, by the outbursts of applause with which references to a certain Allied victory were greeted by more than one important Albanian gathering addressed by me in the United States last year. Moreover, the neutrality of Albania has been just as much violated as was that of Belgium. The sufferings of her people have, too, been as great as those of that country, in that her territories have been the scenes of almost continued military operations from the end of 1915 right up to the time of the signature of the armistice. Thus if upon technical grounds Albania has to be considered as a neutral at the Peace Conference, it is clear that the problems bound up with her future should receive even more thorough consideration from the representatives of the Great Powers than should those of the smaller countries who are themselves in a position to be represented by delegates in Paris.

Having endeavoured to show that, for practical as well as humanitarian reasons, Albania has established her right to adequate consideration and representation in Paris, I will now very briefly allude to the two great questions of the present and of the future. The first is the problem bound up with the frontiers of the country—a problem complicated in the extreme. Upon ethnical grounds, and in order to put into force the principle of nationalities, I think that the boundaries, as established in 1913-1914, should be materially enlarged, and that considerable areas of Montenegro, Serbia, and Greece should go to Albania. But although there should be no question of rewards or deserts in settling future frontiers, and although the three above-mentioned countries might be provided with territorial compensation elsewhere, it would be difficult to reconcile public sentiment to the idea of taking large territories from our Allies in order to give them to a so-called neutral. Consequently, whilst any arrangement even approximately corresponding to the one suggested in the agreement* reported to have been signed between Great Britain, France, and Russia on the one hand, and Italy on the other, would be entirely unjustifiable and unfair, it would seem that the Albanians and their friends would do well

* According to this agreement, signed on April 26th, 1915, and published in *The Manchester Guardian* for January 18th, 1918, and elsewhere, Italy "is not, in the case of the creation of a small autonomous and neutralised State in Albania, to resist the possible desire of France, Great Britain and Russia to distribute among Montenegro, Serbia, and Greece the northern and southern parts of Albania."

to work not for the establishment of a new and enormously enlarged Albania, but for the rectification of their present frontiers, which, having been established and recognised by Europe only about six years ago, cannot now be reasonably opposed by any of the Great Powers concerned.

If that policy be adopted as a basis for settlement, the necessary modifications should be considered under two headings—those respectively affecting the north and the south. In regard to the first, whilst I agree in a general way that the new boundaries proposed by Captain J. S. Barnes, R.F.C., in his paper published in *The Geographical Journal* for July, 1918, ought to be more or less closely adopted, for reasons just enumerated, I do not think that this is feasible. But as there should be no question of giving Serbia access to the sea by way of Albania, or of sanctioning the incorporation of Scutari, the population of which is preponderatingly Albanian, in a Slav State, the northern frontier should certainly be modified in such a way as to give the tribes of Hoti and Gruda, and the town of Djakova, and perhaps Ipek, to Albania. More to the south-east and east, Prisrend and Dibra ought to go to the same country, but Struga and Ochrida should remain non-Albanian. These changes are necessary, not merely on the general principle of nationality, but because the above-mentioned tribes are so absolutely Albanian in sentiment that they will never peacefully accept Montenegrin or any other form of alien rule, and because Djakova, Prisrend, and Dibra, and to a lesser extent Ipek, are towns with which the people, domiciled in areas now forming part of Albania, had always been wont to trade up to the time of the Balkan wars, and with which they must continue to trade unless new and artificial centres are to be created.

To the south of Lake Ochrida, and therefore in the areas in which the rival claims of Albania and of Greece predominate, the latter country has considerably more to say upon the nationality basis than has Serbia in the north. On the other hand, with the exception of the Corfu Channel question, she has no reasonable arguments of strategical or commercial requirements to put forward. But though the question is undeniably complicated, and this because the Greek Church has left no stone unturned to prevent the development of Albanian sentiments among the Orthodox community, and to Hellenise that section of the population, when I went through the now disputed areas, in the late autumn of 1911, I found that Moslems and Christians were combining against Turkish oppression, and that both elements were prepared to risk their lives and property by fighting for the interests of their nationality. Thus, at a time when the Albanian question had already been forced into prominence by ever-recurring revolutions, and by the Turco-Italian war then in progress, but before the beginning of the Greek occupation, which in some of the disputed areas has been almost continuous since 1913, the numerous Greeks and representatives of the Orthodox Church, who tried to do so, were unable to convince me of the legitimacy of their claims or of the truth of their statements to the effect that the great majority of the Christian population was Greek by race and sentiment. Indeed, if actual proof is wanted that

these arguments were not and are not justified, it can be found in the fact that Korcha (Koritza), claimed and we believe now occupied by Greece, has always been a centre of Albanian culture and education, and that a large number of the most active nationalists belonging to the various Albanian communities in America come from that town, its neighbourhood, and other districts, erroneously said to be Greek in sympathy.

These being the circumstances, there are two alternatives for arriving at a settlement in the south. By the first the whole question would be more or less re-opened, the futures of the Albanian areas claimed by Greece and of the Greek districts coveted by Albania being discussed. In this case it would be possible to arrive at a decision either by seeking the opinions of experts upon the subject, and by hearing evidence from representatives of the interested parties, or by endeavouring to ascertain the sentiments of the populations themselves. In this latter direction two interesting proposals have recently been made—proposals to which neither party could have reasonable cause of objection provided they were properly carried out in their spirit and in their letter. M. Venizelos is reported to have stated in an interview with a French journalist that he was desirous that a plebiscite should be taken, and that the freedom of the ballot should be assured by an American occupation—a method satisfactory provided such a plebiscite and such an occupation included also the districts of Greece claimed by Albania. The Albanian representatives in Paris, on the other hand, are reported to have asked the Conference to give America a mandate to occupy and to administer, for two years, the Albanian territories of Northern Epirus claimed by the Greeks, on condition that the same country occupies for the same period the Hellenic territories claimed by the Albanians.

Both these suggestions are excellent in themselves. Whilst the first is, however, open to the danger that, even with an American occupation, the people, many of whom undoubtedly are still without a well-developed national conscience, would be liable to be unduly influenced by their religious or other chiefs, the second possesses the disadvantage that it would only be temporary, and that fresh measures would have to be taken at the end of two years. It seems to me, then, having regard to the fact that the International Commission, presided over by the late Colonel Doughty Wylie, in 1913, did its work much more thoroughly and efficiently than did the corresponding body in the north, that at the risk of injustices to both parties, the frontier then delimited should only be modified so as to give the whole of the road from Santi Quaranta to Korcha to Albania instead of leaving a limited stretch of it to pass through a triangular area of Greece. This is necessary because even if new routes have been constructed, as they are reported by General George P. Scriven, of the United States Army, to have been constructed, from Santi Quaranta to Valona, and from the latter town through Tepelini and Agirocastro into the interior, unless Albania is to be robbed of large parts of her southern territory, this former Turkish road, which was in good condition so long ago as 1911, is very important as a means of access to the port of Santi Quaranta.

Experts are irreconcilably divided as to whether the Albanians are or will be fitted in the measurable future for self-government, and therefore upon the question of the future status of their country. My opinion, formed as a result of several journeys in Albania and of some knowledge of the Albanians domiciled in the United States, is that, on account of the aspirations of their neighbours, of the lack of development of the country and of the inexperience of the vast majority of the people in all matters pertaining to modern government, they cannot, for the present at any rate, exist or manage their own affairs entirely alone. If this be correct, as a return to the state of things existing between the Balkan wars and the European conflagration is not possible, the only alternative is for Albania to be maintained as a Principality under the League of Nations, a mandate being given to some Great Power to carry out the decisions of that organisation. As in the cases of other Near Eastern areas the ideal mandatory Power would be America. Such an arrangement being, however, hardly feasible, the task must naturally fall to Italy, who has already shown that she is desirous of furthering the establishment of fair government, the growth of education, and the development of the country generally. If this policy be adopted by the Peace Conference I feel very strongly, however, that the selection of the Prince—and there must be a foreign Prince, for the Albanians would not readily understand the meaning of a Republican government, and they certainly would not accept a native ruler—should rest in the hands of the League of Nations, and that the Italian mandate should be defined in its nature and length.

With regard to the kind of government actually to be inaugurated, I think that the mandatory Power should take the Albanian Chiefs into its confidence, and discuss with them the nature of the *régime* most suitable of adoption. If success is to be achieved, history has nevertheless already proved that the central Government must be national, that the country must be organised more or less on the cantonal plan, and that the patriarchal and communal systems must be recognised and supported. In other words, whilst numerous foreign advisers and experts must be appointed to establish and supervise the gendarmerie, the finances and the general development of the country, everything possible must be left in native hands, for it is futile to endeavour to force an unacceptable administration upon a superstitious, independent, and warlike people. For the rest, and in a word, there should be a democratic autocracy, the Prince being advised and supported by a Government formed of members chosen from all over the country, and from among the representatives of the three different religions, that Government in its turn being strengthened and upheld by the establishment, as soon as possible, of some form of elective assembly.

The foregoing remarks will be sufficient to prove that the solution of the Albanian question, which must be effected for material as well as for moral reasons, is beset by countless difficulties. The problem is not, however, insoluble, provided that just frontiers, destined to prevent the second creation of a still-born child, are guaranteed by the League of Nations. The people are brave, hard-working, patriotic, and trustworthy by those whom they can respect. Their

country is so geographically important, so beautiful, and in some parts so fertile, that, although finance is certainly a great obstacle to be overcome, its development may well justify the money sunk for that purpose. Even if the adoption of some of the proposals made above may leave Italy under the obligation of providing the sums necessary for that purpose without the possession of an indefinite and unlimited mandate, in view of her direct interests involved in Albania as a whole and in Valona in particular, that Power may find it desirable to give or to find the necessary guarantees. And, on the other hand, if the suggestions herein discussed be not popular with the many Albanians, who desire to be entirely independent, these patriots will do well to remember that, in addition to helping them to establish good order and to bring about the prosperity of their country, the protection of the League of Nations, together with an Italian mandate, will provide them with safeguards—safeguards without which they would not only be helpless to enlarge, but also powerless to maintain anything even corresponding to the frontiers established under the auspices of the London Ambassadorial Conference.

H. CHARLES WOODS.

March 15th, 1919.

P.S.—Since the completion of the above article reports have reached the outer world to the effect that Albanian refugees are flocking down towards the Adriatic Coast from the districts of Ipek, Plava, and Gusinje. It is said that 2,000 have reached Scutari and that 5,000 more are *en route*. If these reports be true, and there is good reason to believe that they are true, they signify that, as was the case when I was there in the autumn of 1913, the largest town in Albania is once more being overrun by numbers of destitute men and women, who, on this occasion, will have to be fed by the Allies unless they are to be allowed to starve, which is unthinkable. Such a development, too, proves the necessity for a careful consideration of the Albanian frontier question and for an arrangement as to the mutual transference of discontented minorities to countries where they will be at home. In regard to these particular districts, allotted to Montenegro after the Balkan Wars, sufficient be it to say that they are disputed between that country and Albania, and that Captain Barnes correctly points out, in his paper mentioned above, that the cession of Plava and Gusinje to Montenegro by the Treaty of Berlin—a cession hotly contested at that time by the Albanian League—was afterwards rescinded. I agree, therefore, with that writer and with Mr. J. D. Bourchier—the well-known Balkan authority—who discusses the question in his article published in *The Quarterly Review* for October, 1917, that there should be changes, to the advantage of Albania, in this area, and that the above-mentioned districts ought to go to that country.

March 20th, 1919.

H. C. W.

MAN AND THE MACHINE.

IT is not easy to analyse national or world psychology when under the shock of a vast upheaval. One is apt to take abnormal circumstances too much into account, whereas their close proximity really puts them out of focus. Not for a generation at the very least will it be possible to examine the full significance of so world-wide a calamity. We cannot foresee the ultimate ramifications of the consequences of a shock which has affected practically all civilised humanity. And the incidents of the war itself must be viewed in the perspective of history before they can assume anything like their true proportions. Both actors and spectators can easily underrate and even overrate the importance of events they have so recently witnessed.

Those who declare that the war in its unparalleled magnitude, apart from conflicting national policies to which its immediate origins can be traced, must have been the culmination of an evil state into which human society had drifted, do not carry much conviction by their arguments. They point to some pet mischief they have spent their time in denouncing, and explain how a just retribution overtook people who refused to listen to their exhortations. Some of them go very far in particularising the special vice which led to this portentous result, and no doubt in many cases their diagnosis of cause and result is very absurd. But it is by no means an idle speculation to seek outside the purely political and diplomatic sphere symptoms in the contemporary stage of human development which contributed to, or anyhow were not unfavourable to, the occurrence of such an abnormal cataclysm. In covering the ground, however, it would be practically impossible to avoid the field of acute controversy because no one will pause to reflect on general considerations, such as the state of human society, the standard of ethics or the direction of the march of civilisation, while they are taught to look for the causes of the shattering conflict of physical forces merely in concrete incidents, or in specific lines of policy and national ambition.

Let us, therefore, put the war outside the purview of our considerations so far as possible, and attempt to examine whether during the last century any significant process of change has taken place in human affairs, and whether any transformation in the conditions of civilised communities and the objects of human endeavour are definitely noticeable.

The astonishing revolution in the habits and conditions of human society which came about in the nineteenth century has never been adequately emphasised. If a survey be taken of the hundred years it will be found that the advent and rapid advance of machinery gradually revolutionised methods of transit, communication, and production to such an enormous extent that the last century stands out as the period in which the greatest change of any in the whole history of the world was effected in human intercourse and industry. As regards transit, Rameses and William IV. travelled in precisely the same way with horses and a wheeled conveyance, and sent their

communications by the same means. From the time ships were first invented in the remotest antiquity for thousands of years down to the last quarter of the eighteenth century they were propelled in the same way by oars and sails. The first steam railway made its appearance about 1825. The electric telegraph came in about 1833, and the first cable was laid in 1850. The telephone service assumed a practical shape in the late seventies. Steam navigation began with ships propelled by paddles in 1781, by screw in 1802. The first voyage of a steamship to America was in 1819, to India in 1825. And now the whole civilised world is covered with a network of railroads, trains conveying passengers and goods to the remotest corners of the land, frequently and rapidly. Shorter distances are covered still more frequently and rapidly by motor-cars, motor-buses, tubes, electric trams, and bicycles, so that a man in the course of a few days can cover a mileage which would have appeared to his grandfather nothing short of a miracle. Thousands of ships speed across the ocean hourly from all the ports of the world, and aeroplanes promise a further advance in the direction of still greater rapidity, specially with regard to oversea journeys, though we can already cross the Channel in less than two hours, and reach America in a very few days. Mails are now conveyed by train and motor, so that where a letter took weeks and months to reach its destination it now takes hours and days. The cheapness and rapidity led naturally to a large extension of communication. In 1840 169 million letters were delivered within the United Kingdom. In 1905 over 2,707 million letters, to which must be added over 800 million postcards. Telegrams enable us to communicate with Paris in a few minutes, and with Pekin in a few more minutes, and the convenience of this almost instantaneous method of communication is increasingly appreciated. While in 1871 about nine million telegrams were despatched, in 1905 over 89 million such messages were sent, and, of course, in the last ten years, all these figures have been exceeded. But the written message did not satisfy us; we wanted to speak to one another, however far separated we might be, and telephones now help us to keep in touch with our business and social acquaintances whenever we feel inclined to talk to them, without rising from our chairs. So much for transit and communication.

In industry a similar transformation was taking place, aided by the increased facilities for conveyance and distribution. In agriculture the operations of reaping, threshing, and ploughing have gradually been usurped by machines. The steam thresher appeared in 1803, the reaping machine in 1812, to which a self-binding apparatus was added in 1879. Steam ploughs came in towards the latter part of the century, and numberless other agricultural mechanical contrivances such as chaff-cutters, hay-makers, &c., began to be adopted. Spinning and weaving were still more profoundly affected by the inventions of Hargreaves and Arkwright at the end of the eighteenth century, which gradually came to be adopted, until one man turning a crank or lifting a lever was able to do the work of a dozen men or more. Machines were invented for knitting and sewing, and gradually every conceivable article

from a pin to a packing case was turned out by a mechanical process. The steam saw sliced planks off the tree trunk more easily than a man could saw a half-inch board; steam lathes turned chair and table legs with incredible rapidity; steam cranes and numberless other machines speeded up the labour of building; ships by means of continually improved processes could be built far more rapidly; and marvellous triumphs of engineering made various colossal works of construction as easy as the building of a cottage.

Printing, the invention of which can always be pointed to as one of the greatest landmarks of human progress, developed under the influence of machinery at an inconceivable pace. The country became flooded with newspapers and cheap literature. A newspaper with a circulation of a million can be turned out in the course of one night, and you may watch a vast roll of paper converted into a bound book while you wait, like the pig that is transformed into sausages, or the moving platform which emerges after a few hours bearing a finished motor-car. Good literature may have been brought into the poorest home, but the ill effects of the propagation of bad literature and low ideas outweighs the good effects of cheap printing, and it would not be too much to say that the prostitution of the art of printing is one of the most serious evils of modern life. The effort of writing has been more recently superseded by typewriters. Your author lounging in his armchair can communicate his great ideas to a dictaphone, and see the typed pages of his composition a few moments afterwards, avoiding all the wearing trouble of writing, re-writing and re-writing to which his predecessor was subjected.

The arts, too, have been caught up in the wheels. Music, painting, and the drama can be produced by machinery. For one person who hears a singer or an orchestra, thousands hear a gramophone. For one person who plays the piano, hundreds play the pianola. For one person who sees a play acted, ten thousand visit the cinema. Photography has brought portraiture within the range of the poorest. Colour printing reproduces in the cheapest form the rarest classical masterpieces. These have become helpful arts in themselves, and have not degraded their parent art in the same way as the gramophone and the cinema.

But the field in which the most striking achievements of mechanical genius have been manifested is undoubtedly the manufacture and perfecting of engines of war. The concentration of mechanical enterprise on engines of destruction began long before the war broke out; and now guns, shells, rifles, bombs, mines, gases and tanks have reached an unheard-of standard of excellence which appeals to our national pride, and calls forth a chorus of admiration at the latest attainments of our mechanical genius.

As to the social consequences of these extraordinary changes which have been briefly summarised here, they cannot be said to have reached anything approaching their limit. Rapidity of transit and communication has made the world very much smaller. Journeys can be undertaken which only a few years ago were out of the question. The more remote and unexplored parts of the

earth can be reached without difficulty. But so far as international intercourse is concerned, nothing like full advantage of the new facilities has been taken. Financiers, perhaps, more than any other class of person, have profited by the closer contact which they now enjoy with one another all the world over. Commerce has benefited and easier imperial expansion in the political field has roused national ambitions and given a new cause for international jealousy and conflict, with very doubtful benefit to the new regions which have been brought within the reach of so-called advanced civilisation. But true internationalism, that is to say, the growing consciousness of human solidarity which disregards the superficial obstacle of national frontiers, has hardly dawned, although this might have been materially assisted by the new close proximity into which peoples who had hitherto been foreigners to one another might have been brought. The wrong agencies have been the first to take advantage of the new order.

The advent of machinery into agriculture and the growth of the factory caused at once an industrial revolution. No books describe the far-reaching dislocation brought about by this change better than the "Village Labourer" and "The Town Labourer," by Mr. and Mrs. Hammond. "The men and women of Lancashire and Yorkshire," they say, "felt of this power that it was inhuman, that it disregarded all their instincts and sensibilities, that it brought into their lives an inexorable force, destroying and scattering their customs, their traditions, their freedom, their ties of family and home, their dignity and character as men and women." And again: "To all the evils from which the domestic worker had suffered the Industrial Revolution added discipline, and the discipline of power driven by a competition that seemed as inhuman as the machines that thundered in factory and shed." The outbreaks caused by the new power, however, subsided, and a new system took the place of the old, bringing in its wake new social evils, and deepening the chasm between classes and between rich and poor. The conditions in the health and the well-being of the worker were by no means improved. Nor did more easily made fortunes help the general welfare of the community or improve the prospects of the worker. The new and powerful ally which had come to the aid of the capitalist and the landlord ultimately drove the worker into more submissive acquiescence in his despair at the strength of the giant forces by which he was dominated, and seemed to make the prospect of anything like an equitable social system more remote. Education, it is true, progressed, but whether the avalanche of newspapers and cheap books has materially added either to the intellectual or moral improvement of the people's minds is very questionable.

It would, perhaps, be unfair to declare that the age of machinery has by no means added to the sum total of human happiness, because it would be difficult to say what period or what changes or advances ever had. No doubt our ancestors, clad in skins and sheltered in caves, were as happy as, if not happier than, we are. But it may well be asked whether machinery has added to the sum total of permanent human achievement. And that question can

be answered with a decided negative, except possibly in the field of science. Yet science it is to which we owe the whole change. The machine, it may be said, is an achievement in itself. But where is it going to lead us? We are proud to have subjected the tremendous forces of steam and electricity to our service. Machines are good servants but cruel masters. It turns out that they have got the upper hand, and gradually and surely we are becoming enslaved. We may not be conscious of it. But our ambition is to make further labour-saving, trouble-saving, time-saving machines. Machines beget further machines—wheels, wheels, wheels! They lure us on. It would almost seem as if they appealed to some primitive instinct—the mechanical instinct which appears in most children from the time they begin to spin a reel on a pencil. Do we spend more profitably the efforts we save? Do we use the time we gain for greater endeavours? By reduced effort and increased comfort do we achieve more? It is to be feared not. The strange fascination holds us. The precise functioning of a well-oiled machine pleases us. To watch a vast machine lifting its steel arms and performing with unfailing accuracy the most delicate work, gives us a sense of power, a sense of mastery over matter, and satisfies our ever-increasing craving for efficiency, punctuality, rigid discipline, and prompt results. Our best inventive genius, our astute brains, and our greatest abilities are devoted to devising and perfecting and improving machinery. Mechanics and engineering offer the richest prospects to our enterprising youth. It is not only a question of working machines, but of manufacturing machines and of constructing machines to make machines.

A still speedier turn-out, a still faster journey may yet be attained. There seems to be no limit to what machinery may do for us. The mania for speed is ever on the increase. Our fathers may have been content with going six miles an hour; we are not satisfied with going sixty. Yet, nerve-shattered and racketed, somehow we get through no more. Most of us have no time for leisure, no time for reflection, no desire for quiet days. We must hustle and bustle in breathless haste, whirled from one spot to another, while a large portion of our population are condemned to become, in their specialised mechanical employment, as much part of machines as the wheels, the cranks, and the pistons themselves.

Now it is impossible to suppose that this terrific transformation in the work, the habits and the conditions of life in man, has not wrought a great change in his character, in his mind, his heart, his soul. Superhuman in its accomplishments, the machine remains as inhuman in its nature as the cold steel of which it is composed. Man in his devotion to it assimilates some of its characteristics. Just as every trade and profession leaves its particular stamp on a man's character, so the machine to which he gives so much of his service casts his yielding human nature into its hard iron-bound mould. The machine moves, it does its work, it even has—as all who attend to it know well—its moods. Superficially, it appears to be almost human, but really it is inanimate, soulless, rigid. And so, with its inexorable power, it not only enslaves us in its service, and tempts us to increase further its range

and influence, but it gradually transforms the very nature of the people whom it has enthralled.

A psychological change becomes inevitable; and the character of that change is curious. The dominance of the machine does not constitute an evil moral force which must be combated: it does not resemble the spread of false doctrine or pernicious ideas, for these must originate in human agencies. It is the sterilising, alluring spell of a soulless companion, an Undine, cold and insusceptible itself, yet exercising charm and attraction, and drawing within its dominion slaves who in their admiration and devotion readily fall victims to its increasing power. And all the while because we have created it we are under the delusion that we control it. Little by little we have become impregnated by its peculiar influence. Efficiency, precision, and speed become our idols. Utilitarianism, commercialism, materialism reign supreme. Our values have altered, our souls have hardened. The power of action signifies more to us than the power of thought. Material well-being is the primary object of our political and social schemes. Religion is not scoffed at, but ignored. Moral considerations are subsidiary, if they are taken into account at all. The quantitative test is more needed than the qualitative. Artistic perception counts for very little unless it is accompanied by practical dexterity. All our ideas have become commercialised. For imagination unless turned to mechanical invention there is very little use. We borrow our standards from our smooth, shining, punctual, accurate, efficient machines, and the more closely men and women can be made to resemble them the better. Emotion and sentiment waste time and weaken the human machine. They can only be provided by way of relaxation in the intervals of our mechanical efforts in the cheap and blatant mechanical form of cinema, or sevenpenny novelette. Originality or even individuality must be suppressed. It is fatal to the smooth working of any engine, and our schools are devised to attempt to exterminate the first buds of this inconvenient tendency. The soul of youth is steeled and hardened, the gentler susceptibilities are discouraged. The whole outlook on life is changed, the kaleidoscopic view prevents depth of feeling; the actual, the practical, the immediate blot out the more elusive and remote and ideal objects of living. Breathless activity gives the illusion of constant accomplishment; the easy moulding of all matter without strain or effort gives a sense of power. In the age of stone, and in the age of iron, man's ingenuity increased, and his capacities became more highly developed. In the age of machinery he has created a force which has usurped many of his functions, and is subordinating him to the position of a servant, a menial, a slave.

Compare an old *repoussé* silver cup with a modern stamped silver cup,—the art of the hand and the mind with the art of the mindless machine. It may be taken as a symbol of the change not only in the work but in the character of man. In the one you will see the mark of the tool—the personal touch—you will trace the gradual moulding of the design, the line emphasised here, more delicate there, full of character, rough perhaps, but sensitive, eloquent of skill and beauty. In the other you will find complete

accuracy, absolute balance, faultless detail, with a rigid, lifeless, flat correctness that renders it dull, meaningless, and charmless. The latter can be repeated numberless times, and spread broadcast, while the former is unique and individual—the special work of an artist. Cannot we have both? Yes, we can. But the prolific output of the machines gradually ousts the laborious art of the handicraftsman. He becomes reluctant to compete, and people gradually fail to recognise the merit of his work over that which is so easily brought within their reach, and which soon satisfies their blunted artistic sense. So the machine wins all along the line, and gains general approval.

The dominion of the machine is a present fact, and in the future is likely to be carried still further. Without our machines we could not exist; to curtail their uses would be impossible. Even the attempt to rescue here and there handicrafts from destruction are pathetic and futile. But in our blindness do not let us pretend that we are quite unaffected ourselves. Even those whose lives are not devoted to the service of engines cannot avoid coming into constant contact with them, and benefiting by their productions. It would be ridiculous to suggest that many results are not beneficial. But do not let us run away with the idea that we are participating in a great progressive stride. It is not progress at all. It is only change—change fraught with new and still incomprehensible dangers.

However, we need have no fear that ultimately human nature being the stronger force will not triumph over and duly control its inanimate and powerful helpmeet. But in the transition stage the sudden progress by leaps and bounds of this new organism has far outstripped our power to adapt ourselves to the new form of life: and unless we face the danger that we are running, and fully realise the deterioration which, psychologically more than materially, is taking place in the national character here and elsewhere, we shall have to pass through a period of serious moral decline, out of which it will require a profound spiritual revival to lift us.

ARTHUR PONSONBY.

THE DISSOLUTION OF THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE.

THE last four years have been so prolific of historical events of the first importance that it is somewhat difficult for the ordinary observer to preserve a due sense of proportion. For the people of the islands the rapid decline and collapse of the seemingly triumphant German military Empire is naturally the most absorbing occurrence. Ten months ago Germany, apparently erect and victorious, filled the horizon of men's thoughts; other phenomena seemed slight by comparison. The disintegration of the Habsburg Empire was hardly an unexpected event, and it has passed us by with a curious lack of interest. The dissolution of Russia was a phenomenon at once unexpected and at first sight incomprehensible.

It was indeed difficult to believe that a great Empire, whose solidity and endurance had more than once astonished the world, which had survived the German irruption of 1915 as it had the Napoleonic invasion of 1812, would within a few months of the Revolution of 1917 become a mere sanguinary chaos, an object of contempt to friend and foe alike. Yet there were circumstances connected with the constitution of Russia which rendered the catastrophe not merely natural, but practically inevitable.

To go to the root of the matter: the Russian Empire as it existed in 1914 was inhabited by a population consisting primarily of Aryan and non-Aryan elements. This distinction, however, may for the purposes of this article be ignored; what is of more importance is that it was made up of Slavs and non-Slavs, in the proportion, roughly speaking, of 75 per cent. of the former to 25 per cent. of the latter. The non-Slavonic element included a variety of lesser nations, tribes, and septs, very various in race, civilisation, and religious belief, and also in the nature of the ties which bound them to the Empire. The Georgians of the Caucasus, though they have long since lost their ancient name, have national traditions dating back to a period more than a thousand years anterior to the beginnings of Russia; and their absorption into it was a purely political step dictated by the instinct of self-preservation. The annexation of Finland was the result of a military conquest; and the same is to be said of other outlying limbs of the huge Empire. That in the generality of cases the Russian conquest has been an almost unmixed benefit to the subjugated races has no bearing upon the present subject. The important fact is that the outlying parts of the Empire were attached to it by no durable ties of sentiment or affection, and when the strong central government was removed a rapid falling away on their part was to be expected.

History offers many parallels to this state of things. The Roman imperial annals are especially plentiful in them. Whenever the control of the central administration became relaxed autonomous or semi-autonomous states sprang up within the boundaries of the Empire. Britain was more than once independent. During the reign of Gallienus almost every province had its

"tyrant." There was not perhaps any conscious withdrawal from the Empire, but it is probable that old local sentiment counted for more in the formation of these ephemeral states than is generally supposed. Its existence is certain in the case of the curious Palmyrenian frontier kingdom of Odenathus and Zenobia. It may be inferred in other instances. The kingdom of Ægidius, which arose on the Seine in the last days of the Western Empire, had certainly a pronounced Gallo-Roman sentiment behind its establishment. When in 1204 the Eastern Empire disintegrated after the sack of Constantinople by the Westerners, the various states into which it broke corresponded to a certain extent to distinct nationalities. The Despotate of Epirus was Albanian, and the shadowy Empire of Trebizond, though its ruler was a Comnenos, was essentially a revival of the old border kingdom of Lazica. The states which are springing up within the bounds of the former Russian Empire largely represent distinct nationalities, and their separation from the central Slavonic mass need cause no surprise.

It is the disintegration of this Slavonic mass which has caused the most astonishment. That the non-Slavonic peoples should form independent states was not unexpected, but the disruption of the predominant Slavonic element seemed an incomprehensible event. Actually it was not so. The splitting off of the Poles, separated from the Russians as they are by a deep cleavage of national hostility and religious difference, was a perfectly natural occurrence. Among the Russians proper there were conditions which made for disunion.

While the Russians appear, upon the whole, to be racially homogeneous, it can hardly be said that they as yet constitute a nationality. In the Empire they fall into three main divisions, each of which speaks its peculiar language or dialect, and has claims to be regarded as a distinctive nationality. The Great Russians of the central provinces, grouped round Moscow, are the true nucleus of the modern Russian or "Moscovite" Empire. But linguistically and in general appearance they differ much from the White Russians of the west and the Little Russians of the Ukraine. So pronounced are some of these differences that many writers, of whom Waliszewski is perhaps the best known, incline to the belief that the Great Russians are not Slavs at all, but Slavised Finns and other Mongol races. Prince Kropotkin denies this, but it is at least clear that in the north and north-east the Finnish strain is considerable. Along the Volga there is a large Mongol or Mongoloid element, by no means completely Slavised at the present day.

The Little Russians of the southern and south-western plains have perhaps a better claim to be the original Russians than the inhabitants of the Moscovite regions, but the probabilities are that the race is to the full as mixed as any in the world. The South Russian plains have been possibly more overswept by migratory swarms than any other portion of the surface of the earth, and it is not reasonable to suppose that its population has escaped infiltration and overlay at the hands of the foreign elements which have so often intruded themselves among it. In any case the Great

Russians and Little Russians differ in many respects from each other, and from the White Russians of the western provinces.

There is, therefore, among the racially united but linguistically dissimilar Russians much which makes for disunion and discord. It is probable, also, that at bottom there is a racial tendency to disintegration rather than cohesion. So far as it is possible to judge from historical records the Slavs have less power of cohesion than, perhaps, any other division of the Indo-European race. When they began to flood across the Danube into the Roman Empire in the sixth century that one of their characteristics which seems most to have impressed itself upon the historians of the period was their political chaos. There is, I believe, no contemporary record of any Slavonic people possessing a degree of political organisation as far advanced as that of the most backward of the Teutonic peoples which overspread the Roman West. The Slavs never seem to have been anything but a welter of petty tribes and septs, and really united action among them was a rare if not an unprecedented phenomenon. Their migration into the Empire was only in a very limited sense a hostile one; it was certainly not due to any desire of plunder or territorial aggrandisement. On the contrary, it is practically certain that it was forced by the pressure of migration and hostility in the rear. The Slavs naturally fought with the Roman troops who, equally naturally, endeavoured to stay their progress. But there was no premeditated hostility, much less any concerted plan of settlement. Once established in their new abodes the Slavs showed no desire to encroach. Each tribe remained "squatted" over the area into which it had intruded itself, retaining hardly a shadow of intercourse with its neighbours. The unification of tribes into a single political unit was a rare occurrence. When it took place it was almost always the work of a powerful and vigorous chief or line of chiefs, like the Nemanyas of Serbian Rashka. Also it was never permanent. The unity of Serbia was always precarious, and at the death of Stephen Dushan the apparently imposing kingdom flew rather than fell into many fragments. Union among the Bosnians and Croats was even rarer and less permanent than in Serbia, and what is said of these comparatively advanced and well organised South Slavs may be observed with far greater emphasis of their backward kinsfolk on the Great European Plain.

One apparent exception to this condition of pacific, or at any rate unenterprising, disunion there is, but it is merely apparent. That apparent exception is Bulgaria. But that the Bulgars, though Slav in speech, possess more than a thin strain of Slavonic blood is improbable. Their distinguishing characteristics are distinctly non-Slavonic. From their first appearance in history they have been a warlike and aggressive people: for a long period they had a record as destroyers of civilisation equal to that earned by the Magyars or Pachenegs. Their hostility has frequently been directed against their supposed Slavonic kinsfolk. It is worthy of note that they passed easily under Turkish rule, that they appear very early as mercenaries in the Turkish ranks, and that, alone among Balkan nations, they made no spontaneous

effort to free themselves. It is a reasonable inference that they are a semi-Asiatic race, and this view is distinctly supported by the evidence of history. That the founders of the kingdom were undoubtedly a Tartar tribe is in itself nothing. But the region in which they established themselves has been for thousands of years a receptacle of fragments of intruding peoples, of whom a large proportion are of Mongol race. In the fourteenth century the Bulgarian forces included large contingents of pure Tartars: at the present day a great proportion of the population of Bulgaria consists of Tartars. Not only is the Bulgar decidedly unlike the South Slav in disposition; he is also dissimilar in appearance. On the whole, the available evidence points to the conclusion that Bulgaria is not a true Slavonic nation, but a distinctive nationality produced by special conditions, resembling in this respect Prussia, which is certainly not a pure Germanic state.

What has been said of the South Slavs as regards ingrained disunion and general pacifism holds good also in the case of Russia. The Russian nation, so far as it is a nation, was the creation of a vigorous, warlike, intrusive people of Scandinavian blood—in a word, the Vikings or “Variags,” as the Slavs themselves called them. The special tribe which imposed itself as a ruling aristocracy upon the peasants and traders of the Dnieperian plains seems to have borne the name of Rus. The East Roman Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitos, a contemporary authority, clearly differentiates between Russians and Slavs, and the specimens which he gives of Russian names are pure Scandinavian. For a brief period this infusion of fierce warrior blood appeared to have created a Slavonic Empire. But the Russia of Vladimir I. was an ephemeral appearance, and before the death of his grandson it was already lapsing into a disorder which only grew worse as years rolled by. The centrifugal tendencies of the Slavs had full play. The country upon which the Mongol storm broke in the thirteenth century was a mere chaos, and not the imminence of destruction could produce even a shadow of combination against the destroyer.

Nor did the bitter humiliation of the Mongol yoke have any effect in drawing the inchoate mass of states together. It merely so happened that one of the Rurikovich dynastic branches produced a remarkable succession of able rulers who, with iron determination and undaunted perseverance, set before themselves the end of gathering together the scattered Russian lands. Prince after prince of the ancient Scandinavian line settled in Moscow pursued that end through good and evil fortune. No doubt their methods were often base and cruel, but at least their object was a great one. Before the end of the fourteenth century the ruler of Moscow had achieved so decided a primacy that Dmitri Donskoi was able to rally most of the Russian princes beneath his banner when he set out to fight Khan Mamai on the Field of Woodcocks. Slowly and painfully, with many disasters and set-backs, the lands were gathered. But always there was the old centrifugal feeling working against the unifying policy of the Moscovite Tsars. We can see how strong it was as late as the reign of Ivan “the Terrible,” and it is possible to understand, though not to justify, some of his

half-crazy atrocities, when we realise the dead weight of prejudice against which he was struggling. Slowly the idea of unity gained ground, but it was still extremely nebulous. A community of religion was recognised, and there was a certain sense of unity beneath the Tsar, but every relaxation of the Moscovite control was marked by outbreaks, which, characterised as they all were either by the narrowest spirit of local autonomy or sheer desire of licence, tended only towards anarchy. As late as the Seven Years' War the instinct of nationality was still so weak that a military historian, speaking of his fellow soldiers, alludes to them not as "comrades" or as "compatriots," but as "co-religionists." The unifying bond was still a religious and not a national one. There was the common orthodox faith in the mind of every peasant. The idea of the Tsar as chief of the Orthodox faith was inextricably interwoven with it. The widespread opposition to Peter the Great's reforms was based very largely upon the ground that they were irreligious. After the conception of this quasi-theocracy came, but at a vast interval, the conception of the Tsar as a national chief. The sense of national, or at all events racial, unity existed, but in a dormant condition. It was active only in great national crises such as that of 1812, and even so it was closely bound up with powerful religious feeling. The Panslavism of the nineteenth century was hardly a national doctrine. It no doubt had much in it which was patriotic and indeed elevated, but in practice it was confined to a small circle of exponents of the idea of expansion by any and every means.

But be this as it may, the evidence of history points to the conclusion that the racial tendencies of the Slavs are all in the direction not of national unity, but of communistic disunion—that is, of political impotence. Only when there has been a strong central executive has Russia exercised a powerful influence. When this was removed or weakened there was invariably a relapse into something resembling anarchy. It was thus in the twelfth century during the decadence of the Rurikovich line at Kiev, and so continued for three centuries. The same phenomenon appeared in the early seventeenth century after the death of Boris Godunov, and it required two generations of steady concentration to rebuild Moscovite Russia once more. To-day the sudden removal of the Tsarish rule, combined with foreign invasion as in the seventeenth century, has brought about a similar condition of things. Historically the lesson is plain to read.

The union of Russia was the work of the Tsardom. With all its faults it gathered into one mass a congeries of petty states, tribes, and cities which were usually engaged in internecine war, totally unable to offer any resistance to foreign invasion, or to recover, of their own volition from the effects of such disasters. The Tsardom did for centuries cope successfully with foreign invasion, and it initiated or assisted colonial expansion in brilliant fashion. Internally it substituted for the old anarchy at least freedom from civil broils and a beginning of orderly administration which, however rude and imperfect, was better than anything which had preceded it, and, as I have before pointed out, not ill adapted to the requirements of a country which is far behind its western neigh-

hours and Allies in civilisation and economic development. Whatever its defects, its fall has been the signal for an outbreak of anarchy as dreary as any in history, which furnishes a terrible commentary upon the capacity of the Russians for political self-government.

Historically, therefore, there is nothing especially astonishing in the dissolution of Russia. It has repeatedly lapsed into anarchy in former days, and unity and prosperity within its bounds have always been highest when the central rule has been strongest. The tendencies of the Slavonic race, so far as can be gathered, have always lain in the direction of village communism as the highest political development; and this, combined with the heterogeneous nature of the Empire, has again and again led to anarchic conditions once the central control has been relaxed.

In a former article, written at a time when Russia still seemed intact, and was rendering splendid service to the Allied cause, I expressed my disbelief in any radical change of government being of service to Russia, and specifically pointed out that the establishment of a so-called republic would imply nothing but a domination of the "intellectual" minority over the vast mass of illiterate peasantry. The reality has proved worse than the foreboding, the "intellectuals" themselves having proved to be incapable of ruling, and having allowed themselves to be cowed and dominated by a small group of men who at best are gloomy fanatics, and at worst absolute traitors to their country and to humanity. Russia, its connecting bonds suddenly snapped, has fallen into utter disorder. It may perhaps be said that in the central regions the Bolsheviks exercise some kind of control, but it is a despotism of a worse type than any which Russia has endured in the past. In the Ukraine there is virtual anarchy; so far as the Ukrainian Republic is a reality it is precisely what I predicted two years ago—a domination of intellectuals and military men over the mass of the population. It cannot be too frequently or too emphatically stated that there are not to be found in Russia the materials of which a republic can be constructed. The primary necessity for a republic is an intelligent and educated popular electorate, and in Russia it simply does not exist. The crude material from which a nation, in the best sense of the word, may by long and arduous effort be fashioned does exist in abundance, in the form of a people eminently hardy, patient, and brave. But as yet they have received hardly the slightest political instruction, and in their unsophisticated ignorance they are at the mercy of any demagogue, whether he be fanatic or knave. The writer sees no salvation for the unhappy country except in the establishment of some form of monarchy with a powerful central executive. Otherwise the disorder in Eastern Europe will not decline, and may continue to increase. Russia to-day is as the man possessed of a devil who on returning to his house found it empty, swept, and garnished. She has taken unto herself seven devils and more in the place of the ancient supposed devil of Tsardom, and truly it may be said that her last state is worse than her first.

EDWARD FOORD.

NEW WINE IN OLD BOTTLES.

WHILST it is the old who were responsible for the conditions which led to the war, and the middle-aged who had to direct it both at home and abroad, it is the young who had to carry it on, and either to die or drink to the dregs the cup of its bitter experience. Now in the period of reconstruction it is the young who, in the light of what that experience has taught them, will have to build up the new world. All are agreed that it is to be a new world; many think that this will involve a new social and political system, even a new religious system. As those of the young who have survived come back with all that experience of which they cannot or will not speak, hidden behind external forms and ways to all appearance strangely unchanged, what will they think of the way in which the old at home have carried on the work of the nation, and how will the old welcome their new ideas and changed points of view as they begin slowly to discover them? There will of necessity be a gulf between those who have been out and those who have stayed at home, but the gulf must be bridged. Neither the old nor the young are as a rule very good at building bridges over the gulf that separates them even in normal times. Samuel Butler dismissed the task as hopeless when he said how unfortunate it was that the generations should overlap. The gulf now will be deeper than any that Samuel Butler can have known, and the future depends upon the possibility of bridging it.

It is a situation where compromise will not do. The world needs the new wine, needs it in all its purity and freshness, needs it where it is sharp and effervescing, needs it even where it is immature. But there are only old bottles to put it into. The world cannot wait till new bottles are made—can the old bottles fit themselves to hold the new wine?

The old have had to carry on the work at home as best they could, they have had to make plans for the future, to sit on reconstruction committees, pass education bills and discuss Church reform. New committees were formed to consider each problem as it arose. Perhaps what is now most wanted is the new point of view born of the contact with reality, of the experience of suffering, and of the conviction of the unimportance of death. Probably the chief hope of the future lies in the opportunity given for this new point of view to prevail. We need it in all its freshness, in all its sharp bitterness, applied to all the different activities of life; we need even its destructive, critical spirit that it may test the very foundations of our social life, if our dreams of a new world are to be realised.

But the old bottles will be afraid when they see the new wine coming, and if they break the wine will be spilt. There is still work for the old bottles if only they can have sufficient faith and hope to be ready for the new wine. The old must get rid of fear. They fear chiefly the unknown, always the great cause of terror. They long to get back into the old comfortable ways, the ways they knew, which seemed so safe. It is hard to recognise that this cannot be, to be willing not even to

try to get back to them, and to follow instead what seems an uncertain lead into a strange future. But the young must be left free to lead, even though they may not know themselves where they are going. The old must cherish no delusion that they know and understand what the young are wanting. Even the most sympathetic, the most wide-minded among them, have little idea of the ferment in the minds of those of the younger generation who think. Everything is questioned, the old sanctions are swept away, and to destroy seems the first necessity. Yet in all the seeming chaos of ideas and opinions, there reigns an indomitable search for truth, an unflinching determination to get at realities. This is the spirit which must not be quenched, the spirit which will in time lead into all truth, and it is the truth which will make men free.

The old do not always realise how afraid they are both of truth and freedom. They believe that they love the truth, but it is the truth that they have known, that they have discovered for themselves. They value freedom, but it is freedom to do the things they approve, which their experience has shown them to be right. They must realise that it is never possible to stop the search for truth. Truth would be a poor thing if any generation could hold it all. Neither can it be foreseen into what strange places freedom for self-development may not lead those fired by the spirit of adventure. It is not the caution of the old and of the experienced that can wisely restrain those impetuous spirits. They will make many mistakes, but the mistakes must be their own, and the only thing that can save their mistakes from being disastrous will be the sincerity of their own pursuit of truth. The time will come when the old must be content to stand aside and watch whilst experiments are tried and mistakes are made, and even what may seem to them the spirit of revolution reigns supreme. Then the spirit with which they watch, the readiness they may show to help when asked, the character of the advice they may dare to offer, and the kind of sympathy they are able to show will be not only infinitely important for their own peace of mind and happiness, but supremely powerful to help or to hinder the great work of the future.

They must be prepared never to be shocked, to suspend judgment where they cannot understand, and to listen in silence when their opinion is not asked. They must keep their experience, their superior knowledge, if they happen to have any, in the background, and they must listen to the crudest statements and the wildest suggestions with interest and real sympathy. Neither interest nor sympathy need be feigned. By this time even the dullest of the old must be beginning to be at least dimly conscious that the world has not been so wisely ordered by them that change, even drastic change, may not be needed. It should be at least interesting to hear how the young propose to improve on the old ways, and their vision and enthusiasm should be able to kindle at least some slight response in hearts not altogether crushed by disappointment and disillusionment. If only the old can use their experience and the long training of life in such a way as to give them hope, a true sense of values, a real confidence in the future, they will offer to the young a tribunal before which, unconsciously perhaps to either side, even

without a word being spoken, wild proposals can be tested, new ideas weighed, and new proposals judged. It is by winning serenity, the serenity which is not born of indifference, and which has no kinship with the grim temper of callousness, but which has been won through the long discipline of suffering and the unshaken confidence in the triumph of love, that the old will best help the young. This serenity will make it impossible for them to be shocked, though they may sometimes be amused, and the very fact that they can be amused without being supercilious or captiously critical will save them from seeming to be remote or aloof. They may have an atmosphere of their own, but they will bring it with them into other people's lives, and not withdraw into it for their own peace and comfort.

No doubt there will be many too sorely tried by the dust and disappointments of life to stand by in such a spirit as this, whilst they watch the doings of the young. But at least they can stand by in silence and refrain from interfering. If they have lost hope themselves, they should be the last to stand in the way of those who are still brave enough to go on. This is not a time when any spark of hope or belief in the future should be quenched, even by the most disillusioned. Amongst the ways in which the old seek to prepare themselves for the work of the future, it may well be that none is more important than the cultivation of the spirit with which they will watch the future work of the young. It must be a spirit not only free from fear, quick to understand, and little prone either to criticise or to judge, but it must be free from prejudice and all the sour fruits of experience. It must be the opposite of the spirit which says "I told you so," or "Of course I thought that; I went through that phase long ago." It must also be full of patience. It is impossible to tell what forms the inevitable reaction after the strain of war may take. We must expect much irritability of nerves and temper, a natural desire for ease and comfort, and for the enjoyment of all those things of which men have been so long deprived. We shall probably see a revolt against rules and discipline and ordered ways, and there will be a sense of separation from those at home who have not shared their bitter experiences. If it is true that those at home could not understand the real nature of the life at the front, and it was certainly disguised from them by the constantly recurring pictures of smiling Tommies and heroic sub-alterns, it is equally true that those at the front understood little of the life of people at home. How could they guess what was the pain of the long grey days of anxiety, or the weariness of monotonous toil at dull, unaccustomed tasks, with the constant grim background of dread anxiety, since what they saw of home life was only the wild rush of the few days of leave, when by very necessity life was lived on the surface, and thought was banished just because realities could not be faced? So the gulf must be there now that the work of life is taken up again together by those who have stayed at home and those who have come back. Those who stayed at home must bridge the gulf first. But whilst they should be prepared to look for the new vision from those who come back, they must be ready to wait should it take

time before their experience becomes articulate, and the young are willing to seek expression in action for their new ideas. Many of the young feel that the war has ended their youth and plunged them into middle age. But middle age, as they will find, is the most fruitful time of life, and it is in their middle age, young if counted by years, that the new wine of their youth must come to perfection for the life of the world. The old must help and make it easy for them to bring to expression all that is fermenting within them, and must leave them free to translate it into action.

Much of this still lies in the future, there is still need to prepare the spirit which may make it possible. The old were called back to work when they thought that their days of rest were drawing near. Whether they felt fit for it or not they had to carry on the work of the country. Even the comfortable arm-chairs in the Athenæum had to be deserted. Elderly men had to leave what they considered their well-earned rest in order to administer the affairs both large and small of the country. It is not only that they had to put in long hours of work, but they had to face new and unprecedented conditions at an age when their minds had lost their elasticity, when many of them had lost the sons on whom their hopes were fixed, and when for all life had to be lived amongst shattered ideals and in the ever-deepening anxiety of an uncertain future. They may well have felt old, helpless, disheartened, and quite unfit for the work they had to do. It was not heroic, there was no excitement about it, there were no Victoria Crosses to be won, there are no applauding crowds to praise their dull deeds of endurance. All that they had to do was to carry on the work of the country, and they could only see their work in its true light in proportion as they remembered that it was not for themselves, not for the comfort and security even of their wives and families that they had to carry it on, but in order that those of the young who should come back might be able to realise their dreams.

At the beginning of the war there was a widespread opinion that controversial matters must be allowed to rest till the war was over. But as the long years dragged on it was seen that this was impossible, and would lead to stagnation and build dams in the way of progress. The way had to be cleared for advance. The Church if it was to inspire and guide the spiritual life of the nation must be freed from the shackles which prevent it from reforming itself in accordance with the demands of a new age. The children of those who have suffered and died must be provided with a better chance for full development of mind and body, the women who have shown their capacity to respond to new calls to service must be given the full responsibility of citizenship. Even at such a time the country could not stand still, and it was for the most part the old who had to direct its advance. Still, now that the war is over they should have as chief desire to open up the new ways along which others will tread. In so doing they should take care that nothing precious is lost. It is not for the old to be destructive, that is the business of the young. There is a special use for the conservatism of the old, and a very special danger when they are seized with an irresponsible spirit of destruction, careless as to what may happen

when they are not there to see, or so absorbed in the dangers of the present that they are reckless as to the future. The precious things that have come to us from the careful tending of the past must not be thoughtlessly sacrificed to the needs of the moment. It is an urgent duty of the old at this time to preserve for the young the inheritance of the past. If the young decide that they do not want it, it is for them to destroy it. For the moment the old bottles must keep the old wine. It must not be poured out till the new wine is ready to take its place. The day is coming both for new wine and new bottles.

The real difficulty comes when old and middle-aged alike find themselves called upon to make room for the young. It is always difficult for old and young to work together; yet for the good of all each should be able to make their full contribution. This difficulty will be accentuated in the future. The young are discontented with the world as it is, they are impatient for change, they will not be content with mere patching. The old may be more inclined than ever to say, that since they have been in charge of a particular piece of work for twenty, thirty years, even since its very inception, they know all about it, and know that the proposed change is an impossibility. The dead hand of the past will be heavier than ever unless we beware. But if the old are wise they will realise that to lay that dead hand on the hopes of the future makes for no one's happiness, not even their own. It is so easy to confuse experience and prejudice, fear and caution. The heavy hand comes down when it is the light touch of sympathy that is needed. The fact that a thing has been thought or said or done twenty years ago is supposed to finish the question, and if the young still have enough hope and energy to re-open it they are listened to with pained faces and anxious hearts. This attitude not only hinders progress but it increases the troubles of old age. Those who would be happy in old age must believe in the future, welcome the visions of the young and feel that the best they can do will be to remove hindrances out of their way. The experience of life should make men tolerant of the most diverse opinions, since to him who observes it must have shown how little opinion matters in comparison with character. It is the sincerity of the young in the search for truth that really matters, not the wild, adventurous roads they may choose to travel in that search. Hope is to many a difficult virtue in these days. May that not come in large part because their hopes for the future have rested on a continuance—they probably call it a development—of the things they have known? And now the world they have known has crashed to pieces around them, and the possibility of rebuilding it grows day by day more remote, and so the future is despaired of. Does this not imply a fundamental disbelief in life, as well as an entirely wrong sense of values? Perhaps it is the clear vision of the young that can help us best to discern what really matters. They have to make the future; the old would gain peace of mind if they could learn to trust them more. If they were more ready to listen to them than to discourse about their own experience. They have a contribution to make, but they must wait till it is asked for and not obtrude it. It cannot be fully

made unless they have succeeded in remaining young in spirit, and have so lived with the young in sympathetic understanding that they can be interested in them and in their views when they neither agree nor approve. To listen in a hopeful spirit, to try to understand and not criticise, this should be the attitude of the old. Children used to be taught not to speak unless they were spoken to, and old people would do well to return in this respect to their childish days and not give advice or even opinions unless they are asked. The vital thing is to keep a teachable spirit up to the very end of life, and not only to realise that even when old we must always go on learning, but that it is in large measure the young who will be our best teachers. The things which are hid from the wise and prudent are often revealed to the babes. To remember that this is possible will be the best antidote to the constant irritation caused by the utterance of crude opinions, by the self-assertion of the young and by what the old are wont to consider their want of reverence and respect for authority. It is not that the young are always right and the old always wrong, but that somehow both must struggle together as equals to find the light, if truth is to prevail.

There were some fighting at the front who thought bitterly that the war had been caused by the old and middle-aged, who directed it from home and used their influence to prevent what they called a premature peace, and that the hardships of those who fought were increased by the incompetence of those who sat safely in the hundreds of different Government departments. Can they be made to believe that for the best of the men at home no thought was harder to bear than that, as Professor Murray put it, other men "are dying for them, better men, younger, with more hope in their lives"? And whilst they died, the older men and the women had to keep alive the cause for which they were dying, in order that when the end came they might hand over to those who remained a country for which it would be worth while to live, and which was worthy of the sacrifice poured out. Together they have to learn in the light of the universal destruction of these years of war what are the things that really matter. That is the supreme question of these days. The young are finding the answer, and as they give it the old must be ready to listen, to help them to make articulate the confused medley of new thoughts and ideas which come to them, all that new wine not yet mature. It may have to go into the old bottles for a while, but if the old bottles have patience and sympathy they will be able to keep it safe till the new bottles are ready.

LOUISE CREIGHTON.

THE FUTURE OF MEDICINE.

THE methods of investigation and the type of individual who prosecutes research have altered during the last fifty years.

Before that time the investigator was a man engaged in medical practice, who, recognising in his patients problems that needed solving, sought their solution by experiments conducted by himself or under his supervision. This was the method pursued by such men as Harvey, Hunter, Jenner, and Lister. This type of investigator has almost disappeared, and research has passed mainly into the hands of the laboratory worker. This has been due to the elaboration of laboratory methods. It is readily conceivable that when any country is first opened up it will yield a great many new features. The development of laboratory methods has yielded a remarkable number of new facts and greatly advanced our knowledge. The perfection of mechanical instruments for the examination of the body during life and of the tissues after death has been of the greatest service. Moreover, the germ theory of disease has thrown such a flood of light upon many diseases that the impression has been made, almost universally, that it is only by laboratory methods that progress in medicine can be attained. To such an extent has this conception prevailed that distinguished laboratory workers can assert without fear of contradiction that progress in medical knowledge can only be advised through the laboratory. The outcome of this conception is seen in the manner in which research in medicine is encouraged. The various Governments, as well as wealthy donors desirous of helping humanity by the relief of suffering, give liberally, and at the same time almost invariably direct that the money should be spent on laboratories. Hence, in all countries we see magnificent buildings erected, and able men appointed for the carrying out of research. To these laboratories are attracted all the most brilliant among the younger members of the medical profession. As generation after generation is brought up under the auspices of the laboratory worker the belief becomes established that on these lines alone can medical research be advanced, and other lines of investigation are neglected.

Underlying all this seemingly reasonable belief there lies a fallacy. Investigators are now specially trained for their work under men who have spent their lives in the laboratory. The pursuit of knowledge tends to become ever more and more academic, and to have less bearing upon the problems confronting the doctor who practises medicine. This is in contrast with the methods pursued by the great pioneers whose names I have mentioned. Laboratory workers now get a limited view of disease, and we must recognise that their opportunities permit them to see but a very small part of the field of medicine.

The reaction of these views upon medical practice is seen in the breaking up of clinical medicine into a series of specialities. No longer shall one intelligent practitioner be responsible, the patient must be scrutinised by a number of specialists. Thus when a patient consults a physician, the physician, not content with his own examination, sends him to a series of experts, and each of these

sends in a report dealing with the organ or method of which he has special knowledge. The physician studies these reports, and is supposed then to be in a position to treat the patient. This method seems so learned and thorough, and it has so impressed the community, medical and lay, that it threatens to become an invariable procedure in the examination of patients. We find medical men not only practising it in their private capacity, and associating together for the purpose of carrying it out, but even urging its adoption by the State.

That it is nevertheless a fallacious conception there can be no doubt. It is manifest, in the first place, that the bulk of the people must fail to receive adequate medical provision under such a scheme. It is only the few who can afford the high prices that specialists charge. If Institutions, even under the Government, were started, only a limited number of the people could be reached. Anyone who has practised in a large community knows that such a scheme would have little effect, for many patients are bedridden, and the number of ailing people is so great that no institutional means could examine them. Moreover, the cases sent to such an institution would not be those that are most in need of help. The type of case sent would be the manifestly ill, usually with some definite sign that indicated that the disease had already caused destruction or alteration of tissue. The cases in the early stages would not likely be sent, if sent their ailments would not likely be recognised; for the phenomena created by the onset of disease are not revealed by mechanical means or laboratory methods. Generally speaking, the physician trained in the laboratory or hospital ward can recognise neither the mechanism of production nor the significance of such symptoms as arise in the early stages of disease.

But, granted that exhaustive reports are received from specialists who deal with X-Rays, blood-pressure instruments, electro-cardiographs, bismuth meals, test meals, blood counts, microscopic and chemical examinations of the blood, and other methods—for it is manifest that there is no standard that can limit the number of specialists—who is qualified to assess the value of all these reports? The effect of disease is rarely limited to one organ, in many cases it is secondary to conditions elsewhere. The specialist whose horizon is restricted to his particular subject is incapable of recognising remote causes and effects. As a matter of fact, the profession have not yet recognised the importance of the assessing of the value of symptoms, while in the practice of medicine there have not yet been employed appropriate methods by which the knowledge can be acquired.

The best way to understand how medical investigation should be pursued is to appreciate the defects in medical knowledge. For this purpose the life history of disease in the body, and the phases that have been studied so far, should be considered. The onset of disease in the body is invariably insidious, and causes little disturbance to the economy and no visible sign of its presence. By and bye the patient becomes conscious that all is not well with him, and there is a loss of that feeling of well-being which accompanies the healthy state. Disagreeable sensations arise, at first vague,

but later more definite; finally they grow so urgent that advice is sought. No evident sign of disease may be perceived, however, on the most careful examination. Later on the disease, as it continues to advance, modifies the tissues of the organ in which it is situated, so that a physical sign is produced, and its presence detected. The course of the disease thereafter varies—the attack may end in death or in impaired health, or—being of a temporary nature—in recovery. It may be a matter of days or of many years; but the general characteristics of the resulting state are the same.

Doctors detect disease by the presence of symptoms. Hitherto in clinical medicine the chief progress has been made in the minute study of disease after the patient has died or after the malady has produced a physical sign—that is to say, after the tissues have been damaged. It would not be far wrong to describe the last fifty years of clinical medicine as being the era of physical signs.

It is universally accepted that the earlier a disease is detected the more amenable it is to treatment. It behoves us then to recognise disease in its earliest stages. If careful consideration be given to the matter the importance of recognising the early stages of disease will be realised, and, moreover, from the patient's point of view it is vastly more important to observe the early stages of disease than to recognise its peculiarities when it has produced physical signs, or when it is found on the post-mortem table.

What are we doing to discover these early stages? The truth of the proposition that the earlier a disease is discovered the more hopeful it is for treatment is indeed admitted; but it has not been seriously attempted to provide the necessary knowledge. Research has been restricted chiefly to laboratories, and in a less degree to hospital wards. Consider the stages of disease that are studied in these places. (It is unnecessary to dwell upon the careful study in the post-mortem room, as that is a stage which does not interest the patient.) In hospital wards we find the patients with disease so far advanced as to present a physical sign, time and care are spent in teaching these physical signs. The result is that very soon little interest is excited in the student unless there is something he can either see, hear, or feel; and so the well-trained student leaves the hospital convinced that he has grasped the essence of medicine because of his ability to detect a physical sign and to discuss the mechanical basis of its production. Moreover, in the more advanced schools, where there are clinical laboratories, it is always to the wards that they are attached. This gives the opportunity of confirming the knowledge of the cause of the physical signs, and the impression on the student of the essential importance of physical signs is thus heightened. We see, therefore, that disease, when it has reached an advanced stage, and after it has killed the patient, has been very thoroughly studied.

But what of the stages that preceded? What of the time, it may be years, during which the gradual progress of disease was taking place—the time before the production of a physical sign—the time when the disease was amenable, it may be, to treatment, or more amenable to mitigation than in its later stages? The patient in the early stages shows no objective sign, but he has a definite sensation

which tells him that all is not well. Such patients go to the out-patient department, where are the younger members of the hospital staff—men who have been trained in the hospital wards, where the training has made them adepts in the detection of physical signs. What is their attitude? I have visited many hospitals in different countries, and the procedure is wonderfully alike; wherever I have gone, a patient with no physical sign receives, as a rule, little consideration. When at last a physical sign is detected, he may be sent to the hospital ward. This attitude towards a patient without a physical sign is made possible by the scantiness of the knowledge we possess of the symptoms in the early stages of disease.

It will, no doubt, be granted that subjective sensations are the earlier signs of disease, and so far the profession has never been trained how to examine a patient when the disease only presents subjective sensations. The sensations of a patient, that is to say, have never been studied with the care and precision which would enable any teacher of the present day fully to appreciate them. There is, indeed, not a single sensation which man is capable of experiencing that has been thoroughly investigated. Until this is done we shall be incapable of detecting the early stage of disease, and it is because this has not been done that I state that the out-patient departments of hospitals have not yet been fully utilised. Take the most universal of all sensations, that of pain—a sensation which, if understood, would reveal the early stage of disease in large numbers of cases. We are ignorant of the most elementary facts necessary to the understanding of pain. We do not even know the tissues capable of producing it, and we have but the slightest knowledge of the nature or kind of stimulation that can induce it. We are, to a great extent, ignorant of the mechanism by which it is produced, and of the laws governing its radiation we have no knowledge. We know, for instance, how informative the spread of pain is in heart disease or renal colic, because the distribution of the pain is so remarkable; but the distribution is equally informative in many other diseases of which we know little or nothing. As one who has laboured much at the subject, I assert that, once we have discovered all the facts concerning pain, a stride forward in our knowledge of clinical medicine will have been made which will lead to some of the greatest discoveries in medicine. What is true of the neglect of the study of pain is true of every other sensation, such as exhaustion, giddiness, faintness, palpitation, nausea, heartburn, and breathlessness.

It is evident, then, that the study of the early stage of disease is of the very first importance, and that the recognition of the nature of the disease is infinitely more difficult at this stage than when a physical sign is present. It will be necessary to alter the practice in hospitals. At present the easily-discovered stage of disease, and the most hopeless for treatment, is by custom handed over to the experienced physician, while that which is most difficult to diagnose and the most hopeful for treatment is placed in the hands of the least experienced.

There is another matter that has never been clearly understood,

viz., the aspect of disease as presented to the family doctor. Those whose experience of medicine has been limited to the laboratory, the hospital ward, and the consulting room, have no idea of the difference between their kind of practice and that of the general practitioner. I may point out that the bulk of the general practitioners' patients present none of the physical signs that were taught him in hospital. The complaints of the every-day patient are chiefly subjective in character; physical signs, when present at all, are of an elusive and evanescent character—the sort of signs that were overlooked or ignored in hospital experiences. These elusive signs, nevertheless, indicate the early stage of disease, and may do more even than this—they may indicate the presence of some affection which in itself may be of little moment, but which, by lowering the vitality of the patient, may prepare him for the onset of other more serious diseases. When engaged in general practice I was struck with the difference in the character of complaints met with. As time went on I found that the symptoms to which I had paid little attention were frequently evidences of the onset of serious diseases.

It must strike everyone that notwithstanding the enormous amount of work and money that has been spent on the study of consumption we are still far from understanding its cause or cure. It is manifest that there is more in the matter than the presence of the tubercle bacillus. It had long seemed to me there was another factor; and when I reviewed all the cases that occurred in my family practice, I found that every patient had suffered from other conditions years before the outbreak of consumption. I was at a loss to understand whether this was due to a latent infection or to a predisposing complaint. When Arbuthnot Lane put forth the views that the toxins from intestinal stasis lowered the vitality, and rendered the individual susceptible to infection, I reconsidered my series of cases of consumption, and found that a considerable number had been under my care for years suffering from gastric ulcer—a condition itself secondary to the intestinal stasis, Lane maintains. A simple illustration may help to give a clue to the mystery still surrounding consumption. A man suffered from a pustular eruption in his hands and arms, and consulted an eminent bacteriologist, who, examining the pus microscopically, detected an organism. He cultivated the organism and made a vaccine from it. This he injected into the man. The treatment was persisted in for some months, and there was no improvement. The man consulted another doctor, who found the postular eruption was a secondary affection due to scabies or the itch, and promptly cured him.

There are several morals to be drawn from this experience, but the one that is appropriate here is the suggestion that the failure to cure consumption by all the elaborate means at our disposal is probably due to the fact that the tubercular process is, like the pustular disease, a super-added disease, and the proper line of treatment would be the removal of the primary cause of impaired health. Inasmuch as it is now known that a great many people have a tubercular infection, and never suffer from consumption or other serious tubercular disease, it is manifest that there must be

some other factor than the tubercle bacillus. The recognition of this factor can only be attained by the study of the patient before he shows any signs of consumption, and the opportunity for doing this exists neither in the laboratory nor in the consumptive hospital, but is afforded the family doctor.

The final and most important of all branches of medicine is the assessing of the value of symptoms. As soon as a doctor is engaged in general practice he finds out the importance of this aspect of symptomatology. After detecting a sign, the patient's enquiry, expressed or implied, is, naturally, What is going to happen to me? Is this a sign of disease that will shorten my life or cripple me? Does it call for treatment, or is it amenable to treatment? The answers imply a knowledge of symptoms which no hospital or laboratory training can ever completely supply, and yet it is the most important of all forms of knowledge if we are ever successfully to combat disease.

This knowledge of how to assess the value of symptoms, so absolutely necessary to the progress of medicine, distinguishes clinical medicine from all other sciences and all other branches of medicine. For its acquirement methods and opportunities peculiar to itself are necessary. While its importance and even its cardinal necessity are widely recognised, yet the methods by which this knowledge can be acquired have not yet been understood. It has been tacitly assumed that this knowledge has already been acquired, and that it is a field of knowledge that requires no special training for its acquisition. This, however, is a great mistake. We can easily find evidence of the failure of medicine from this lack of knowledge. During the period of national stress, when every available man was called upon for war service, the burden was thrown upon the doctor of determining the fitness of individuals. The military medical authorities thought that the knowledge was easily acquired, and that any qualified man, however young and inexperienced, was capable of undertaking the work. To assist them, certain regulations, vague and often misleading, were drawn up. The results of recruits' examinations were found so unsatisfactory that radical changes had to be made. The failure resulted from the fact that the knowledge of how to assess the value of the most ordinary symptoms nowhere exists. Even in life assurance, where the most experienced members of the profession are engaged, the basis on which the prospect of life is valued, when some abnormal sign is detected, is to a great extent a matter of guess work. We can see that by reading the books of those who aspire to guide the profession in such matters. Occasionally one physician, more critical than usual, realises the position and describes his limitations. Thus, Sir William Gairdner, in discussing the matter in relation to heart murmurs, states "Whether any data can be procured that will enable our successors to deal with cases of extra risk—we have none, and so deal with them either by loading, or rejecting, or shutting our eyes." How true this is can be verified by anyone who turns to a text-book to find out the prognostic significance of the simplest and most obvious sign. When it is borne in mind that such signs are daily con-

fronting the general practitioner, and that the question of assessing their value is continually arising, it will be recognised that the matter is one of urgent concern. Nevertheless, it is treated in so vague a manner that no clear information is anywhere to be had.

But this defect in the knowledge hampers medicine in every way. There are people who, desirous of keeping in good health, imagine that if they are periodically examined by a doctor they may be prevented from falling ill. But more harm than good is likely to be the outcome; for if some aberration is detected (it may be a shadow in the lungs when examined by the X-Ray, or a murmur or irregular action of the heart) the doctor, unable to assess the value of these signs, may give such warnings as seriously to disturb the patient, and put him to endless trouble and expense to avoid an illness that was never likely to arise. When there is distinct evidence of an active disease the same uncertainty prevails. We all know that many patients with such diseases as gastric ulcer or appendicitis recover without operative procedures. There are nowhere to be found clear indications when to operate and when not to operate. Some surgeons would remove every suspicious appendix, because, though they recognise that some are without danger, yet, being unable to distinguish these from the dangerous, they prefer that the patient should not run the risk. What is this but an acknowledgment that the surgeon cannot assess the value of the symptoms? When such a surgeon says that the symptoms are not sufficient to serve as a guide he but deceives himself, for the data are there, only he is unable to interpret them.

It is manifest that if symptoms are ever to be properly valued, this can only be done by those who have the opportunity of watching individual patients through long periods of time, who see disease at its earliest stage, and who can observe its progress through all the vicissitudes of life. Manifestly the worker in a laboratory or in a hospital ward is not capable of this task. On the other hand, the opportunities of the general practitioner peculiarly fit him for it. He is the only individual in the medical community who has a broad outlook on medicine, whose life-work gives him the opportunity of seeing all parts of medical knowledge in their true perspective. He sees the conditions which predispose to disease; he sees its inception and the course it pursues, when it is amenable to medical treatment, or passing to the time when it calls for surgical interference. He sees the after-effects of the operation, when the surgeon may claim it as a success. If he cares to enquire into the symptoms of disease he is brought into contact with every special department, and has opportunities for estimating these departments at their true value.

Yet at this hour the general practitioner has no say in medical education or research, or even in making the laws which bind him to an unintelligent performance of his duties. There are fields of research which block the advance of medicine, which can only be worked by him. Yet what is done to encourage him? Money is poured out for research, but no one ever thinks of giving him a grant or helping him to make use of his opportunities.

JAMES MACKENZIE.

SLEEPING HEROES.

THE legend of the Sleeping Hero is common to many countries. One might suppose it to be one of those superstitions which advancing civilisation leaves behind, but that we find it realised afresh in the continued refusal of some people to-day to believe in Lord Kitchener's death. No doubt the idea is intertwined with the very fabric of the human heart that there are natures too fine for failure. Of them, at least, the old question: "Why hast Thou made all men for nought?" should not be asked. If clouds obscured their setting, poetical justice demands a new dawn; the world has a right to their service.

So long as fairyland was recognised as a "something between heaven and hell," the valley of Achor had its door of hope. Even the Catholic Church once gave her sanction to belief in a hero's return. Prayers were said for centuries at Grenoble, that the Chevalier Bayard might be allowed to come back before the general resurrection, so that the world might be trained in the principles and practice of chivalry. The fact is interesting also as an authoritative pronouncement that Catholicism did not see in the spirit of chivalry the spirit of Antichrist.

The sleeping hero seems to differ from the sublimated beings whom the pagan invoked as demi-gods and the mediæval churchman as saints. The Roman was "aware of a stately pair" when Castor and Pollux were seen heading his phalanx, and the Spaniard—despite the statement of certain modern historians that the battle itself is mythical—holds to this day the belief that once, at least, St. James on a white horse turned defeat into victory for his country. But these glorified personages vanished as they came, while the hero was to return "in the face and the form that we knew." Scholars may see in the Red Indian Hiawatha a Western Adonis whose marriage with the Laughing Water meant fertility for the soil. But the myth probably floated in the air till attached to the story of a too-mortal chief, who should return from happy hunting-grounds in a winged canoe such as brought Pale-faces from the Sunrise. He it was who should then teach the arts of peace that avert famine, while, as of old, leading his tribe to war and protecting their village and their hunting.

In this, as in all the legends, it is some supreme day of national crisis that is to rouse the sleeping hero. The world's Armageddon should surely have given back one leader, at least, to every combatant nation. Serbia, for instance, could hardly wait for a darker hour than that of her recent devastation to recall Marco Kraljevic (King's son), whom legend declared to have survived the grim day of Kossovo. King Vukasin, his father, fell at the Marica, in 1371, after long war with the Turk, and Marco continued the struggle till that seemingly final defeat. Then despair seized upon him as upon the dying Roland. He cast his mace into the sea, and drove his sword into the living rock, where it has been guarded ever since by his adopted fairy-sister, the Villa Raviyola, who also watches his sleep. But through the ensuing centuries the sword has been slowly rising from the rock, and when it is completely free the hour

of Marco's waking and of the final liberation of Serbia will have come.

The fairy lady, the matchless sword, and the promised waking of the hero naturally remind us of our own Arthur, of Excalibur, and the pale Queens. If

" the island valley of Avilion,
Where never falleth rain nor any hail,
Nor ever wind blows loudly,"

is to be identified with Glastonbury, it may be whispered that the poet had not seen the Somerset lowlands on a day when March wind drives fruit-blossom petals before it and raises dust-devils on the long high road. The courtly spirit of Lord Tennyson suggested a reincarnation of the hero in the rather prosaic form of the Prince Consort as

" Scarce other than mine own ideal knight."

Some Serbians may with more romantic appositeness have seen a return of their hero Marco, though outside their own border, in Mirko of Montenegro. National ballads delighted to call Mirko "the sword of Montenegro"; sober history calls him its Lysander and Tyrtæus. The national army at the battle of Grahovo, in 1858, was led by Mirko in the absence of his brother, Danilo, in Paris. Mirko, in fact, was the elder brother, but had been passed over, in 1851, in his brother's favour, and was content to serve his country as President of the Senate. Danilo's inaction during the Crimean war had made him unpopular with the people. The Sultan had vainly offered bribes. The crisis came in the May of 1858, when Mirko took command of the army, and found 7,000 Turks encamped on the plain, like the French at Sedan. His own 4,500 held the rocky defiles above, yet he made a last bid for peace, sending his brother's secretary a six-hours' journey for the purpose. The envoy was captured, but the outcome was the destruction of half the Turkish force at small loss to the Montenegrins. But despite the sixty battles of his campaigns, into one of which Mirko went after a meal of a few pears, his daughter fighting by his side, the inevitable end was a convention with Turkey in which Mirko's banishment was one of the articles. Before this Danilo had been assassinated, and Mirko once more passed over, this time in favour of his own son Nicholas. His expulsion, however, was not insisted on, and Mirko turned to the arts of peace, wrote verses, planted rice and coffee, and ultimately died of cholera in his son's arms. His widow, Stana, lived till 1895.

If this were indeed re-incarnation, the hero's return served a good purpose. Other sleepers seem to have been undecided as to the right time for their return. Owen Glendower, surrounded in his lifetime by supposed portents, owed something of the weird power of his personality to his startling habit of appearing suddenly in unexpected place. The faith that so great a leader would return was strengthened by the fact that the places of his death and burial were never surely known. It was accordingly characteristic that some

time after his passing he should be seen by the Abbot of Valle Crucis as he walked meditating in the fields at dawn.

"You have risen early, Father," said the vision.

"No, my son," replied the imperturbable monk; "it is you who have risen too soon—by a hundred years."

And Glendower vanished.

Rebel chief as he was, with all the qualifications of the hero of whom such a bard as Iolo of the Red Mantle should sing, history remembers Owen Glendower now rather as the far-seeing statesman and social reformer. "His true claim to greatness," says Mr. Owen Edwards, "lay in his attempt to create out of the disorder" of his time, "with its chaotic law, with its angry passions, with its selfish aims, a nation with settled institutions and high ideals." Among those institutions, Owen desired a Welsh-speaking clergy, and a Church reformed and connected, as in England, with the State; as well as a revival of learning, to be assisted by a Welsh University. This last was no wild dream; a dozen Universities were founded in Europe in his lifetime. Dare we suggest that something, at least, of this hero lives again in Mr. Lloyd George?

Welshmen who refused to believe Glendower to be gone for ever had in Merlin another hero tranced by fairy power. The Siege Perilous of the forest of Broceliande had swallowed up both him and his wisdom, till such time as destiny should choose to call him back. There was also a younger dream-hero. In 1369, in reward for good service to France, Charles V. gave a fleet to Owen Lawgoch, "heir to the Crown of Wales," hero of Welsh legend, but a pathetic and futile figure in history. It was December when Owen sailed from Harfleur and rough weather drove him back. Fresh hopes were budding when, in 1378, Owen Glendower being then nineteen, Owen Lawgoch was murdered at Mortagne-sur-Mer by John Lambe, an English emissary.

Another of the sleeping heroes especially notable as brilliant failures is Sebastian of Portugal. "It is all over for my country, but at least I die with her," said Camoens on hearing of the king's death, at a time when he himself was dying in exile, and in a poverty so extreme that only the begging of a faithful Javanese servant kept him alive. That was in 1578, and before half-a-dozen years had passed two false pretenders to Sebastian's name had been exposed. Yet about 1584, a tiler's son, named Sebastião Gonzales, claimed to be the king, and was supported by a self-styled Bishop of Guarda. The pretender was sent to the galleys, the "bishop" was hanged. Nevertheless, in the next year, one Mattheus Alvarez traded on a personal resemblance, obtained money from a rich farmer whom he created Count de Torras Novas, promising also to marry his daughter, and the royal troops were confronted by a supporting force of 800 men. Once again, in 1603, twenty-five years after Sebastian had fallen in Africa, at El Kasr-el-Kebir, Marco Tullio, a Calabrian peasant who actually could not speak Portuguese, claimed his identity, declaring that he had escaped from the battlefield and had lived as a hermit in Sicily. The Portuguese in Venice believed his tale; and when banished to Padua by demand of the Spanish ambassador, and at Florence, and in the galleys to which

he was consigned, the pretender made so many adherents that finally he was executed. As for Sebastian himself—fair-haired and blue-eyed, with a Hapsburg lip, fatherless at birth, king at three, king-regnant at fourteen, melancholy dreamer, who longed to go crusading, and felt that ‘un bel morir tutta la vita honora’—it was an ill day for Portugal when he gave his power into the hands of an unfit Prime Minister and his mind to visions of crushing the Moor. A project of marriage with Marguerite of Navarre was abandoned for a dream of commanding the Portuguese forces in India. At nineteen he went off from a hunting party for wild raids against the Moors in Africa. Presently, for a more serious expedition, he sought help from the Pope, and received an arrow of St. Sebastian from Philip II. of Spain, and the promise of his daughter's hand, and of 5,000 men. This last promise was withdrawn, however, when the Duke of Alva opined that 15,000, at least, would be needed for effective warfare. It was not surprising that 9,000 of Sebastian's hastily raised force of mercenaries and raw levies were killed at Kasr-el-Kebir. But though Philip of Spain brought home the body the people doubted his death. “What can you do,” said Lord Tyrawley, two centuries later, to the English House of Lords, “with a nation half of whom expect the Messiah, the other half their king, dead two hundred years?”

Mention of the Calabrian claimant reminds us of the long-cherished hopes of peasants in the Romagna that Cæsar Borgia—of all men!—to them a splendid and generous lord, would return again. When, in 1517, the Borgia fell after desperate flight in a dry river bed, his body, pierced by twenty wounds, was stripped for plunder, and so mutilated as only to be recognised by Juanito, his faithful page, “because of his great love.” The young widow, Charlotte d'Albret, mourned her lord in a *chambre ardente* hung ever with black, in the Castle of La Motte Feuillée; and of the Apennine peasants M. Sinkiewicz relates that “Long they refused to believe him dead, but waited for him as a god who should some day return and establish justice in the land, cast down tyrants, and defend the poor.”

It was on a river bank also that the gold shoes of Roderick, “Last of the Goths,” and the carcase of his drowned charger, Orelia, were found. Whether in fact the waters of the Guadalete washed his body out to sea, or whether the beaten king turned hermit and died at last under his dreadful penance of slow devouring by snakes, posterity cannot judge. What is certain is that he had made a personal enemy of Count Julian, Governor of Ceuta, the one Gothic fortress in Spain saved from the Saracens, and it was Julian who advised the Mahometan Musa to attempt the conquest of Spain. When 12,000 men, under the Berber Chief Tarik, landed at the rock that was called after him Jebel Tarik (Gibraltar), Roderick's southern governor, Theudemir, sent for help to his master, then fighting rebel Basques. The fate of a week-long battle at Xeres de la Frontera, where Roderick led 100,000 men, in purple robe, gold crown and shoes, driving in his white-horsed chariot of ivory, was settled after some days by treachery. The two commanders of the wings of Roderick's army were the sons

of King Witica, whom he had blinded and murdered in revenge for his own father's death. Eventually, the green flag of the prophet waved from the towers of Toledo, but Spaniards still hoped that Roderick would return and champion the Cross to victory.

Dietrich, or Theodoric, sleeps "till the Turk shall water his horses in the Rhine." The tomb of Theodoric in Sta. Maria della Rotonda at Ravenna, where he was buried in splendour, in 526, exists still, but unless the skeleton in golden armour, found in 1854 in a rough grave not far off, was his, no man knows his true sepulchre. Nor have the learned finally decided whether Theodoric and Dietrich of Bern, hero of a saga-cycle not less fine than that of Siegfried, though never turned to similar literary account, are absolutely identical. At least, the jejune historical facts of Theodoric's life are interesting enough. A Goth educated at Constantinople, who erected instead of destroying public buildings, and funded money for their upkeep, Theodoric was also an Arian. Consequently, Catholic priests were responsible for varied reports of his fate. His body was carried off by the Evil One, and thrown into a volcano, or the same agency carried him to a desert to fight dragons till the Day of Judgment, or he rode to Hell on a black horse, or on stormy nights he rushed through mountain village streets with Wotan's wild huntsmen. To his persecution of Boethius the world owes "The Consolations of Philosophy." In the light of recent warfare, Theodoric's march from Central Germany to the Isonzo, there to crush Odoacer's pretensions to rule Italy, is interesting: a year-long trek of 250,000 persons, including the families of his soldiers, besides much cattle.

Legends, too, hung round the personality of Ogier of Ardenne, whose name has sometimes been corrupted into Algar the Dane. Ardenne-mark, Dane-mark, Denmark is the easy process. Nieuport on the Yser is the birthplace of the hero whom Morgane-la-Fée hides in the customary fairy-fashion, and until the present war, in the patronal feasts of Huy, near Dinant-sur-Meuse, the figure of Ogier with lance in fist headed the procession of giants, the Four Sons of Aymon, with the hero-horse, Bayard. The twelfth-century poem of Raimbert de Paris records his *gestes*, his expeditions to conquer Paynims, his return from the gates of Paradise just in time for a tourney at Huy, his founding of monasteries, and other peerless generousities. From Ogier descended Baldwin Bras-de-Fer, and his cousin was Charlemagne, who after his reign of forty-six years took his rest, in 814, in the great Church of Aix-la-Chapelle. The embalmed body—or the tranced sleeper—seventy-one years of age, and a warrior even in his seventieth year, was seated on a golden chair, wearing golden sword and chain, and crown with a piece of the True Cross, a golden volume of the Gospels on his knee.

Wise leader and great soldier, representing a culture far in advance of his day, it is no wonder that, as the chronicle records, "No words can express the lament and sorrow that arose over his death, even by the heathen he was mourned as father of the world," and some day he was expected to awake and arise. In 1165, Frederick Barbarossa opened Charlemagne's vault. He, too, according to the legend which Rückert has enshrined in verse, sleeps in the Castle

of Kyffhäuser, in Thuringia, robed and crowned, and throned on an ivory chair, before the marble table into which his flame-coloured beard has actually grown. He still lives :—

“ Er ist niemahls gestorben,
Er lebt darin noch jetzt;
Er hat im Schlosz verborgen,
Zum Schlaf sich hingesezt.”

But now and then his sleep is broken : he beckons to a page, who is sent to see if the old ravens still fly round the mountain, for if they do another century's sleep must pass before the Kaiser can rise to save his country.

More often broken is the mystic sleep of the Irish Earl Gerald under the Rath of Mullaghmast. Here, in 1577, some hundreds of Irish, “ well affected ” to England, were put to the sword, “ most dishonorably,” says Capt. Lee in his memorial to Queen Elizabeth, “ by the consent and practice of the Lord Deputy for the time being.” Once in seven years Earl Gerald wakes and rides round the Curragh of Kildare, on a horse shod with silver shoes. When the shoes are worn thin, a miller's son with six fingers will blow a blast on his horn and Earl Gerald will conquer the English and be proclaimed king. (Sinn Feiners, please note !)

The rosy-cheeked, woollen-comfortered English boy who sings outside frosted English windows of good King Wenceslaus and his doings “ on the Feast of Stephen ” sings a version happier than the real truth. Wenzel of Bohemia at the end of the tenth century was in worse case than Arthur, for his pagan foes included those of his own household. Only the Pope's command had prevented him from abdicating, and entering a monastery. His grandmother, Ludmila, was a Christian, but his mother, Drahomira, and his brother, Wratislav, headed the heathen party, and the Christmas-tide banquet was so full of muttered wrath that the king rose, and made his way barefoot to the Benedictine church. He was attended only, by his faithful squire, Podiven, shivering with cold, if not with fear. The tenderness of heart that could spare thought in that dread hour to bid the lad find warmth in his own footprints testifies to the saintly character of the king. He was pursued, and murdered before the altar, and in 997 Ludmila and Podiven were also martyred. Poetical justice declared that Drahomira perished in an earthquake. In the end, when violent oscillations of belief gave way to the acceptance of Christianity, the bones of Archbishop Adalbert, another martyr, were brought in triumph to Blanik for burial beside those of Wenzel, and his banner and Wenzel's spear were long carried before the army, with a war-cry of trust in “ the Holy Martyrs.” Legend, however, maintained that the king was safely hidden to await better times.

The list of sleepers might, no doubt, be added to. Legends that Robert Bruce had not really died were current, despite the other legend of his heart being cast by Douglas into the fray between Alonzo of Castile and a Moorish host with the cry “ Go first, as thou wert wont to do.” But, in truth, evidence of death counted for very little. The burning of Joan of Arc was a public ceremony, but

Mr. Andrew Lang has told the story of more than one most plausible and carefully-coached imposter who traded on the idea that some common criminal had been substituted for the Maid. The cruelty of her death seemed impossible, and similarly, to another age, the cruelty of the murders of sleeping child-princes appeared incredible, so that Perkin Warbeck won more adherents than Arthur Orton. Indeed, but for the discovery of Warbeck's authenticated letter to his mother in Flanders some modern historians might be willing to hold a brief for him.

Our day of Armageddon proved powerless to waken any hero in the identity promised by old legend. Half-way between the attitude of the modern poet and the old ballad-singer is, perhaps, that which is shown in the lament put by the nineteenth-century poet Clarence Mangan into the mouths of the sixteenth-century mourners for the Irish patriot-hero, Owen Roe O'Neill, in which the spiritual desolation has no overtone of hope :

" We thought you would not die, we were sure you could not go,
And leave us in our utmost need to Cromwell's cruel blow ;
Sheep without a shepherd, when the snow shuts out the sky,
O, why did you leave us, Owen? Why did you die? "

For now a belief in re-incarnation is wide-spread, and hope feels out towards a growing clarity of communication with a Choir Invisible who may work through suggestion while biding their time to return. Have some, indeed, already come back unrecognised, under new names?

LOUISE F. FIELD.

THE NURSERY SCHOOL: AN EDUCATIONAL PROBLEM.

THE problems created by the war and the widespread social sympathy between class and class engendered by it have awakened an almost universal interest in the needs of our children. Even before the war, in certain enlightened localities efforts had been made to decrease infant mortality, and to improve the conditions for little children below school age. These efforts were, however, known only to a select few, and their promoters must sometimes have felt how infinitesimal was the work done in face of that which remained to do. But now it begins to look as if the nation as a whole were preparing to take up the task in earnest; and it is very important that this new effort should be rightly directed, and that we should not lose the wisdom that has been accumulated by the various small scale experiments that have been tried.

From the fact that the "medicine man" now as ever has in the eyes of the public a certain mystic authority, and from the more honourable fact that our physicians have always been in the front rank of social workers, it is perhaps natural that the care of the pre-school child should be widely regarded as fundamentally a physical question. In an interview recently accorded to representatives of the Women's Educational Union Mr. Munro, Secretary for Scotland, is reported to have said, with reference to nursery schools, that Parliament had in certain circumstances placed children under five years of age under the care of the Local Government Board, the view being that the problem was primarily one of health. It is true that Mr. Munro admitted that "incidentally" the problem was one of education as well; but the implication certainly is that the educational aspect is entirely subsidiary or even negligible.

Now there is no doubt that the physiological needs of the children may first of all reasonably demand attention. The conditions of healthy development vary from year to year as the child grows, and are well known. There can be no excuse for not spreading this knowledge as widely as possible, or for failing to insist, as far as in us lies, that it should at least be made possible for our little ones to become possessed of that sound body which has always been recognised as the requisite basis for a sound mind.

In his recently published Report on the Physical Welfare of Mothers and Children (Scotland)* Sir Leslie Mackenzie has some striking sentences which show how far ignorance still prevails with respect to what is essential for the physical well-being of young children. With reference to certain Day Nurseries, he says: "It has been found that, in many places, the ideal is to keep the young children sitting, correctly clothed, and still. As a means of generating rickets, nothing could be better. If there is one thing that the young children need more than another it is constant activity

* The Carnegie United Kingdom Trust, Dunfermline.

of muscle. Anything that restricts the movement of a child is physiologically bad. . . . With fair justice, it has been said of these closed nurseries that, if the children could be kept from being run over, they would be better in the gutter. It is necessary to put this point forcibly, because our inspection proves that the cleanliness, quietness, prettiness, and cosmetic effects generally are apt to take the first place in the minds of the attendants; the children's physiological demands for activity tend to take the second place."

Not long ago I heard of a working mother who while she was out kept her two little toddlers in a box bed to preserve them from the dangers of the floor. Her ignorance of the effects this treatment would and did have on the development of their walking powers is perhaps excusable. But is it excusable that people holding an official position as caretakers of young children should labour under the same ignorance?

If our practice is still so far behind our knowledge with respect to the physical welfare of little children, we can scarcely wonder if matters are worse with respect to their mental welfare. Even when the treatment of the under-five child is verbally acknowledged as being to some extent an educational problem, there are countless little indications that the almost universal opinion is that the child will not suffer in any material way if his education is left to itself till he enters school. This is a terrible mistake. A child's education begins in his cradle. In the majority of cases it is badly begun, and much effort has to be expended to undo the harm of the bad start. This bad start is not to be set down as the fault of the mothers. They, almost without exception, love their children and are anxious to do their best for them. But conditions are against them. In the ordinary workman's home it is only the very exceptional woman who can produce the atmosphere of law and order, of peace and harmony, which best promotes the wholesome growth, physical, mental, and moral, of the little child. Even in more favourable external conditions a profound ignorance of the laws of mental and moral development hinders and perverts the child's growth. Self-will, temper, deceit, and their like may be generated just as easily and just as directly as rickets. So also may habits of inattention, want of observation, and confused and inaccurate thinking. And these habits even at the age of five may not be so easily got rid of as they have been formed.

Among my acquaintances I number a child of three. In her spare time she roams the streets. When she wants food she shouts up to the window of her home, and her mother throws something down to her. She and her slightly older brother by means of screams, kicks, and bad language rule the household. She is now in a kindergarten, but will the kindergarten influence be strong enough to counteract the still continued influence of the home? For such little human problems we require as teachers women of exceptional ability, insight, and poise. They require also to be conversant with the best methods of child training yet

discovered. Nor is it only for such exceptional cases that we require such teachers. The need of the normal docile child is every whit as great. It is commonly said and believed that little children are very weak in reasoning power. All parents, however, who observe their own children closely will, if the children are allowed freedom of action and speech, be driven to conclude that their offspring are exceptions to the rule. As a matter of fact it is the generalisation which is wrong. I have elsewhere tried to show that even in the third year a child's power of logical thought is amazingly well developed in comparison with certain other powers which seem to belong to a much lower stage of intellectual development.* The reason why a child's conclusions seem to us so absurd is usually not because his logic is at fault, but because he is reasoning on a very narrow basis of experience.

An important part of the educator's task is then to see that the child increases the range of his experience. For this it is not always necessary or sufficient to vary the environment. Psychologists have frequently told us that our world depends less on our actual environment than on the activities which go on within us—on what they call selective attention. In the case of the very complex world which is the common heritage of the human race, the attention of each newcomer requires help that it may make the right selection. This help is largely provided by language, which emphasises what to us are important points, and reduces chaos to order. Experience depends on the way we use the environment rather than on what the environment actually is. There is truth in Tennyson's contention that if we knew all about one little flower we should know all about the universe. The highly trained intelligence brooding on the narrow environment will get much. The child left entirely to itself will from even the most favourable environment get very little.

It is the delicate task of the educator so to direct the attention of the child that he gets much even from an unfavourable environment. Left to ourselves we analyse the environment only so far as our immediate purposes require. If the concept "tree" is sufficient, we do not trouble ourselves with the distinctions implied by the terms "sycamore," "chestnut," and so on. Our blind disregard of difference is often extraordinary. The other day I was with a group of three to five year old children, when we perceived some sheep. The children at once hailed them as cows. This was explained by the fact that they had already met some cows at an earlier stage in their walk. Some two years ago I was instrumental in introducing a country child of five to the joy of making a daisy chain. A day or two later she expressed a wish to go and gather some of "thou white things." Apparently neither her own needs nor her social intercourse had caused her to distinguish daisies sufficiently from their background to ascertain their name.

In pleading for open-air playgrounds for the toddler Dr. Mackenzie in a beautiful passage shows what such a playground

* *The Dawn of Mind*, p. 127. Pub. Ed. Arnold.

should do for him. "It takes him away," he says, "for the moment from the rigid mechanism of pavements, dark stone stairs and packed, immobilising rooms. It gets him into the movement of flowing Nature. He can spend his strength against a yielding resistance. He feels the turf elastic under his feet. He can sink in the sand; he can heap it into heaps; he can dig it into trenches, build castles of it, destroy mountains of it, and begin again for ever to dig and build and destroy. He learns to touch soft things softly. He lightens to the light. He flushes to the wind, he leans to it, he fights it, he flies before it, he learns its many voices. If there are flowers, he sees them in their colours. If there are trees, he learns them by their branches. If there are birds, he knows them by their songs. For all the rich hour or two he misses none of the responses in the subtle ritual of Nature." All these things the playground ought to do, but all these things it will not do unless combined with the ideal playground we have the ideal teacher. It is she who must make nature vocal to the child; it is she who by her attitude and her words must introduce light and shade, likeness and difference, connection and meaning into his unanalysed experience. Unless such help is given, many a child will limit himself to the sand heap, and be blind and deaf to the rich possibilities beyond.

At five years of age children enter the elementary schools. What kind of person, according to the experience of infant teachers, is the normal child of five? Here is our type—let us call him John. John comes from a working-class home; his playground has been the street; he is the middle one of five children; he has been on the whole well fed and well cared for, and his mother is a very busy woman. John is a manly little fellow; he is accustomed to looking after himself; he even takes some charge of his younger brother. He likes to be sent a message to the neighbouring grocer, and can remember what he is told to bring back; though if his mother wants two or three different things she usually thinks it safer to write them down. John's general knowledge is sadly limited. He has a superficial acquaintance with horses, dogs, and cats; once he saw some cows, but he has almost forgotten what they are like. "Birds" to him mean sparrows, but in a friend's house he has seen a canary. Even of the animals he seems to know well he has really taken little note. Soon after he comes to school he is shown a stuffed owl. His suggestion that it is a cat is received without a smile—even on the part of the teacher, who is used to this mistake.

John is a silent person. He rarely asks questions, and he never expects to have his questions answered. Nor is it easy to question him, for words like *Where* and *How*, *Why* and *When* have no very definite meaning for him. When he is betrayed into speech it is difficult to understand him, for he slurs his words, dropping out many consonants and altering the vowel sounds in various ways. To some extent he inflects his verbs, but all after one model; *saw* becomes *see-d*; *came*, *comed*; *hit*, *hitted*, and so on. His adjectives are few. Words like *small*, *large*, *more*, *less*, *near*, *far*, he fails to understand. Colour has played little part in his life, and though he has somehow picked up the terms *red*, *blue*, *green*, and *yellow*,

he is somewhat uncertain in his application of them. A few number terms he has also picked up. He can say "One, two, free," but he has never counted things, and would not recognise a group of three as such. It is in the region of language that John's deficiencies come out most plainly. In the fourth and fifth years children in a favourable environment accumulate words with the most extraordinary facility. Many of us have known little ones with a perfect mania for enquiring "What's that?" and by five years of age a vocabulary of over two thousand words is not uncommon.

Nature had endowed John with an active and enquiring mind. During the first two years of his life he had learned much. He "took notice" early, and laughed and cried with intelligence and vigour. By his own efforts he learned to see so that his eyes could direct his little fumbling hands. He learned to distinguish the faces of those about him one from another. He knew their voices. He became able to interpret many sounds. He had come to know the tick of the clock and the creak of the door. Sometimes his mother sang to him, and he had his favourites among her tunes. He understood quite a number of words, and himself said a few words and phrases.

During the third year John's progress slowed down, though his bodily development continued to be satisfactory. He attempted to learn to dress himself, but his mother had no time to wait while he fumbled with his buttons. He soon gave up the attempt as a bad job. He continued to explore his surroundings, but this often brought him into trouble. By experiment he did learn the blackness of coal and the wetness of water, but such experiments were apt to bring smackings in their train. By imitation and observation he did increase his powers of speech, but a new baby had arrived, and mother had little time for play or talk with John, even had she realised the mental needs of her little son.

During the next two years things were worse. It is true the child was now for the most part a denizen of the street, and this fact widened his experience to some extent. He learned to run to the pavement when he saw or heard a motor. He learned something of the possibilities of a hand-cart when left unguarded. Life in the street was not entirely without adventures; but on the whole it was monotonous. John, being a bright boy, rapidly made the adaptations necessitated by his new environment, and then he practically ceased to grow. His mind became a stagnant pool. His observation, superficial and faulty as it was, gave him sufficient information for his needs; and there was nothing in his environment physical or social which now pushed him on along the path which humanity has trodden.

Thus it happened that when John went to school he had at least two wasted years behind him—and these two of the most educable years of his life. Not only had John failed to garner the fruits of this most fruitful period, but to a considerable extent he had lost his power of thought. He had not ascended to higher planes of active mentality, and consequently he had dropped to lower. He was no longer an investigator, a discoverer. His mind had sunk

into a rut. In one word, at five years of age John was already old.

It is more common to starve little children mentally than it is to starve them physically, and it does them quite as much harm. In both cases the healthy child's appetite must be our guide; a good digestion waits on appetite; there should be no forcing, but food which is suitable must be provided. "To be sure," said Mrs. Poyser, "if you go past your dinner time, there'll be little relish of your meat." Some children at five have already gone past their dinner time. Now what is the meat that should be provided? What is the mental food which the child's proper development demands during the first five years of his life? During the first few months Baby is occupied with working up the raw stuff of sense experience into an intelligible unity. He is learning to associate sight, movement, and touch; sound, movement, and sight; he is forming expectations; he is making himself familiar with the ways of his world. He does not need many toys. Things that he can safely put in his mouth are best, for the fingers have not yet become the favoured organ of touch. An ivory ring, the old-established rattle, an indiarubber doll, these or their like he should have for his own. As he becomes able to use his hands, boxes with lids that come off and on in various ways will keep him happily and profitably employed for a long time. Paper that he can rustle and tear, bits of silk, muslin, velvet, that he can feel and pull, a tin and a spoon with which to hammer it—these and other articles found in every house should be at his disposal. He will find out for himself how to use them. He is not yet in need of a teacher.

Before the end of the first year this need arises. Baby begins to distinguish word-sounds, and to associate with them things and actions. His mother teaches him to "wave tata" and to "throw a kiss." His own attempts at vocalisation begin. He needs some one to talk to him, to speak distinctly, to say the same things over and over so that his unpractised ear may pick out the sounds. What a work is this that Baby does in analysing the sound material to which he is now turning his attention! We have only to listen for a short time to some one talking fluently a language that we do not understand to realise in some degree the magnitude of the intellectual task that Baby sets himself.

How can we help him? We can help him by providing material; by speaking slowly and distinctly, by giving him the names of all the things about, by translating our activities into words; by saying and singing the time-honoured nursery rhymes, by refraining from adopting his baby words, and by letting him, if he wishes, watch our lips to see how we make these interesting and useful sounds. Much of this mothers do "by instinct," as we say, but it will be more consistently done and better done if it is done intelligently.

Among Baby's toys there most certainly should now be a box of blocks. The wisdom of our ancestors has decreed that these should be cubical in form, and should have on them pictures of animals and letters of the alphabet. Wisdom I say advisedly, for before the end of the first year pictures make a strong appeal, and are readily interpreted and associated with names. Simple picture

books are invaluable, and a picture book lesson should be given whenever the child desires. I have vivid recollections of the way in which one fourteen months' baby used to implore such lessons. She was unable to speak at the time, but the beseeching expression of her face, the urgency and ingenuity of her significant sounds and gestures sufficiently indicated her intellectual hunger. She was not content simply to look at the pictures; the different parts had to be analysed and named; if this was not done she would take my hand and place it on the page to show that her satisfaction was incomplete. The intentness of the child's attention and the perfection of her concentration made the process an instructive one for teacher as well as for pupil.

Contrary to the general belief, for the first couple of years Baby's world is one of form rather than of colour. Brightness appeals to him strongly, but his sense of colour is often poorly developed even at the end of the second year. We should take advantage of this fact to emphasise certain shapes of which the knowledge will be useful later. Wooden circles, wheels, ellipses, squares, oblongs, triangles should be provided, and should be spoken of by their correct names. Do not call the triangles "three-cornered things," call them triangles, and leave Baby to find out for himself that triangles are three-cornered, just as he finds out in course of time that a dog has four legs.

I have referred above to the letters of the alphabet. These are characteristic and interesting shapes, and may be recognised quite well by a child before he is able to speak. The letters should be named to the child and also associated with their usual phonetic equivalent. The old rhyming alphabets are of great value as teaching material. Baby is quick to apply his knowledge: one often sees little ones studying the nice big letters so thoughtfully provided outside shop windows. A small child of my acquaintance proceeding on her slow way upstairs was suddenly struck by the appearance of a wooden panel in the wall, and gleefully hailed it as "I." In this way a foundation for reading may be laid without any mental strain whatever.

In these days we all know that children should be in the open air as much as possible. Country life is best for them both physically and mentally. In the third and fourth years the ideal schoolroom is a big, grassy field surrounded by trees and dotted over with wild flowers. Pulling daisies is a splendid exercise in co-ordination of hand and eye, and of various muscular movements; and the child takes to it as a duck to the water. If morning and evening the sights and sounds of a farm are available, so much the better; and the educative value of expeditions to the shops must not be forgotten.

At this stage the teacher's main function is clear. She must of course add to the child's joy by sharing it; she must be a real lover of nature and infect him with her enthusiasm; but, as teacher, her main duty is to supply names. All the flowers, trees, insects, animals of the country side should be known to her, and she should be wise in their ways. Spontaneously the children demand names; for thus they gain pegs on which to hang their thoughts, and a

means of communicating with their fellows. The teacher should not multiply words; nor should she seek to penetrate far below the surface of things. The time has not yet come for breaking up a primrose or dissecting a daisy. Besides names, adjectives must be used, particularly those referring to spatial qualities, to colour, and to number—at least up to three or four. This instruction must be given informally, for the children to take or leave as suits their mental needs. I have heard one two-year-old tirelessly “*pu’in daidies*” ruminate continuously to herself, “*Tat nong ta’; tat shor’ ta’*” (that long stalk, that short stalk). In less favourable conditions Dr. Montessori gives the same mental stimulus by means of her attractive cylinders.

When the little ones tire of their activities, they will gather round the teacher and beg for a story. At this stage the best kind of story is a thinly disguised description of how the children themselves have spent the day. No one who has not tried it will realise how much delight this simple proceeding affords. Once the children have taught us, of course it is easy to see how very wonderful it is that by a succession of sounds we should be able to let them live their day over again. By their faces we can see how full of meaning all our words are to them. Their eyes shine, memories struggle to find expression, by eager questions they help along the story. Unwittingly we have begun to teach composition.

The fourth and fifth years are the years generally assigned to the Nursery School or Kindergarten; but probably the methods which there obtain should be carried on for at least the two succeeding years. The children coming from the poorer districts of our large towns who are fortunate enough to enter a nursery school at three have already in life’s upward climb fallen behind their more happily situated little brothers and sisters. This is not because the parents are poor. The children of the rich are often equally backward. It is largely because no one has taken the trouble to talk to them. It is also because their environment has been too narrow; but an intelligent adjustment of this environment would have done much.

The Kindergarten has to set to work to remedy these defects, and to make up if possible for the time that has been lost. As an integral part of her work she must reckon the arrangement of numerous little expeditions—to a farm, to the seaside, to a smithy, and so on. Just here we find one of the reasons why these baby schools must never be large; for in spite of the kind helpfulness of tramway guards, railway officials, and the general public, it is a serious responsibility personally conducting a tour for these little men and women. Another reason for their small size is that the teacher aims at knowing and helping the mothers as well as the children, and every Kindergarten worthy of the name is a centre of valuable social work. Here, however, I must limit myself altogether to the educational aspect. At present it is obviously impossible that the situation of the school should be ideal; but there must at least be attached to it a bit of open space which can be turned into a garden, and in which the children can play and work, and in fine weather sleep. By means of the garden love and reverence for

nature enter the heart of the child. I well remember the solemnity with which last spring little hands led me to do homage to the first snowdrop of the season.

Care of the house and of any pets there may be, music, marching, and games should all find a place in the children's day; but from the intellectual point of view the most important part of the teacher's task is still the fitting of the discrete network of words on to the continuum of reality. Of set purpose she should often take occasion to translate the children's activities into words, thus analysing their experience for them. Some children spontaneously carry on a running description of all they do; a constant chatter is the accompaniment of their play. Even children brought up in a far from literary environment often show great ingenuity in analysis and synthesis. Thus a three-year-old in a Free Kindergarten on being shown a picture of a boy fairy and a girl fairy called them a "burrd laddie" and a "burrd lassie." Great felicity in the choice of words is often shown by quite small children. I recently asked a four-year-old: "What is a worm?" "A messy, sloppy sort of beast," she replied, without an instant's hesitation. "How does it walk?" I further inquired. "It just dra-a-gs itself along," she returned. Her intonation gave the full force of Pope's expressive phrase applied to the Alexandrine, "which like a wounded snake drags its slow length along."

Many people even at the present day imagine that Kindergarten work means keeping little children occupied with bead-threading, paper-mat making, and other forms of handwork. As a matter of fact, these occupations have a very unimportant place in a curriculum in which nature study, language training, and exercises in practical life hold the place of honour. The Montessori apparatus is an invaluable asset to any Kindergarten, for it gives precisely the stimulus to concentration which is what the children require. Not only so, but the apparatus is exactly adjusted so as to enable the child to master those systems of relation which are necessary if he is to carry on further his interpretation of the world. It pushes him on to analyse the dimensions of space, to study colour systematically, to think about number, about sounds, and about words. That thought accompanies the manipulation of the material is often made evident by the children's reflections. Thus Stanley, working with colours, was heard to say: "These are all blue, but they're not all the same blues"; Harry, laying the Long Stair: "This is long, and this is short; Miss Robertson is longer than you; you are longer than me." Agnes, at word-building: "These are letters; that's a word. We speak words, but we don't speak letters, 'cause they don't mean things." Activities thus accompanied are very obviously conducing to mental growth, and to the power of independent judgment.

I am far from thinking that Nursery Schools can make up for the want of a good home—good, I mean, from the educational point of view. But there is desperate and widespread need for them if only to minimise in some degree the enormous differences which are already present in children who are just entering upon

school life. The range of intelligence in one batch of these children, even if we leave aside any who may be even faintly suspected of mental defect, is quite commonly three years. If we make use of the Binet-Simon Scale of Intelligence we find that the bright children have a mentality of seven years, the dull ones a mentality of four. How is it possible to treat such a varied group as a class? Is it not obvious that much time will be wasted and much friction will arise in the attempt to give class instruction to such a heterogeneous crowd of little ones?

These differences, I am persuaded, arise much more from differences in environment, material and social, than from differences in heredity. Children of superior native intelligence often continue activities which have ceased to be worthy of them just because the environment does not provide sufficient stimulus to cause them to advance. If during these early years mental growth is not just as steady and as striking as physical growth we ought to be just as uneasy. The first five years of our lives are the longest five years that we shall ever spend; and during them we should do more than in any other period of equal length to grow to the mental stature of a man.

Certain observations made by Dr. Montessori, in her Children's House in the poorest quarter of Rome, deserve to be closely studied. She says that after some time in the school "all these children are so much improved in their general *nutrition* as to present a notably different appearance from their former state, and from the condition in which their brothers still remain. Many weakly ones have been organically strengthened; a great many who were lymphatic have been cured; and in general the children have gained flesh and become ruddy to such an extent that they look like the children of wealthy parents living in the country." Now when these children entered school the great majority of them had been set down as in need of tonics. "Yet not one of them took medicine, not one of them had a change of diet; the renewed vigour of these children was due solely to the *complete satisfaction of their psychic life*."

It is, of course, matter of common knowledge that happiness promotes nutrition; unhappiness interferes with it, and may (in spite of the most favourable diet) bring about physical weakness and wasting. It is on the face of it, then, not at all impossible that the stunted forms of our little street urchins are due less to want of physical care and sustenance, less to want of the bread that perishes, than to want of that bread of the Spirit that perishes not. If this be so—and I see no reason why it should not be so—then the problem of Nursery Schools is not "incidentally" an educational problem; it is fundamentally an educational problem. And our first and greatest need is teachers—trained teachers who shall be experts in the delicate and difficult, but fascinating, task of stimulating and fostering the early unfolding of the human soul.

MARGARET DRUMMOND.

LITERARY SUPPLEMENT.

LIST OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
1. THE ACADIAN. By J. E. G. DE M.	461
2. REVIEWS	465
EASTERN EUROPE; INTERNATIONAL SPIRITUAL SANCTIONS; ROME; ROMANTIC LITERATURE; THE NEAR EAST.	
3. SHORTER REVIEWS	475
4. NOTICES OF BOOKS	477

THE ACADIAN.

THE war was over, at any rate for this Canadian soldier, and before returning home he determined to visit certain shrines that still called for him. The first was the one-day pilgrimage from London that the Chaucerians undertook, the pilgrimage to Greenwich to the shrine of Aelfeah or Aelfege of Canterbury, a pilgrimage that every good Acadian takes. The second was not the week's pilgrimage to Canterbury, the pilgrimage of *The Tales*, but one further afield, to a village on a moor many miles west, to a village very different from the vill of Greenwich, though that, too, once lay on the edge of the wild where the Anderidean forest sloped down to the murmurous meadowed Thames. First, then, for Greenwich.

The pilgrim took with him an antiquarian friend, and they walked from London Bridge that late April afternoon. The Thames as they crossed the bridge swam lustily eastward past the bastioned Tower on the north, past the quiet wharves of Shakespeare's land on the south, and so they went on, leaving the moral Gower dreaming in St. Saviour's, and pushed their way east as near the riverside as might be, through the throb of springtime traffic, with the children dancing in streets that did not seem drab at all on this shining afternoon, and on through Southwark, past little parks where the grey-green spring had come, and so on into Deptford near to the Church of St. Nicholas, where the dead Admirals keep their proud watch, where the dust is the dust of fighting men who made England the mistress of the seas, the Church of Drake and Frobisher and of their stern successors; and so still on up Old Church Street past the little chapel where Benjamin Disraeli worshipped as a child, and thus into the roaring Deptford Broadway, and so up Blackheath Hill on to the Heath, where the ghosts of Jack Cade and Dick Turpin keep watch and ward though they know not each other. By the time they reached Blackheath the sunset had begun, and as they entered Greenwich Park they moved into a mystic, silent, wooded world of glamorous light and shadow.

As they came the twain had talked much and observed men and manners, but now in the loneliness of the Park a silence fell. The long avenues of stately trees, age and an infinite tradition putting on the wonderfulness of youth in the new passion of one more spring, the stretches of sward clean and shining, the quietude of the bosky groves, the sense of treading places that men had trodden in familiar fashion since the days of the Romans, laid the burden of historic memory upon the pilgrims. They struck through the fresh grass over to the Bower of Queen Elizabeth, where the Roman tavern or villa once stood, and paused under the trees thinking of the Sixtieth Legion that had camped here on its way to meet the Island Queen, Boadicea. Here the sentinels stood. From that height sentinels watched the winding Thames, watched the hills to the south, where the dark rolling forest lay. Just by here the oldest Roman road had run, and up it in the opening fourth century the Christian Bishop of London, Restitutius, must have passed on mule-back seaward and toward Arles. And then they moved on to Wren's Observatory, where old Duke Humphrey's castle had stood, the castle that Cromwell was to capture, and looked down on the spot where Elizabeth had been born in the Palace of Placentia, the site of the home of the great line of English kings from perhaps the thirteenth to almost the eighteenth century, looked down on the old Hospital that Wren had built at the bidding of a Queen for the men who made England what it is.

"The place is alive with history, but what part have I in it?" He had forgotten for a moment, but his friend touched his arm and said, "Come with me." They retraced their steps down the great darkling but moonstruck avenue, and then, turning off to the right, moved through uneven ground, among the ghostly tumuli of the Bronze Age, where sleep the earliest battlers for Britain. Lights were shining from a brick-built house, and his friend said, "James Wolfe lived there." Then they passed out of a mysterious postern gate in the moon-touched eve, leaving the ghostly deer browsing in the twilight, and wandered down Croom's Hill, perhaps the oldest named hill near London, one looking back to prehistoric days. Down they went into the dusk that "unseen hands" were hanging around them, the hands, as it seemed, of an immemorial past, until suddenly they struck the crash of traffic again, and passed out of it into the shrine where they would be. Suddenly they stood above the spot where the man who had wooed and won the Acadian land lay, all that is mortal of him.

"How old are you?" whispered the Englishman. "Thirty-three years old," said the Acadian. "I was 29 when the war began." "James Wolfe," said the Englishman, "had won all when he was thirty-three; he took up arms as a boy. He fought at Dettingen and Fontenoy; he was one of Marlborough's men. He fought at Falkirk and Culloden; in 1757 he was in the expedition against Rochefort. In 1758 he was in Acadia. Then he came home here to the house on the hill. They say that on the day he left he had his last meal at the little inn across the green in Hyde Vale, and then he sailed to relieve Quebec. People here were afraid of this melancholy young man. Someone told the old King that he was

a mad dog. 'I wish that he would bite some of my generals,' quoth the King. Quebec was an old town even then. It was founded, wasn't it, in 1608? On September 13th, 1759, James Wolfe won the Heights of Abraham, relieved Quebec, founded the British Empire, thanked God, and died content. But they brought him home to England on *The Royal William*. The body was brought ashore at Portsmouth on November 17th, 1759, and at midnight on November 20th, 1759, it was laid beneath us here in the church that stands on the place where Aelfege died for justice. You see, I know, we all know, your history." At that moment, through the gloom of the great church, there ran a tremor of music from the old pre-Reformation organ; someone was practising, and the voluntary seemed to link up with silvern notes the immemorial past with some wonderful future full of golden hopes and splendid deeds. Alive with ghosts seemed the old church, full of hopes and dreams and visions, and the Acadian found himself understanding on this spot where Aelfege had died for justice, and, therefore, as Anselm said, for Christ, why it was that Acadia had given so much to make Justice the basis of a new and better world.

* * * *

The other pilgrimage was to a wild and wonderful western moor where men and women still live in the quietude of centuries ago. To a man accustomed all his life to great forest lands, to wide horizons and splendid roaring waters, to a man who had grown up among the things of a world in the making, and had earned a livelihood in the forest primeval, turning the timeless labours of Nature to the patient purposes of man, there was something of home in these wild wind-swept spaces where the deer were still wild, where the little horses were the children of Nature, nurtured in freedom, where the stone farmhouses were as they had been for centuries, where the broad, high-cheek-boned faces told the traveller that here were a prehistoric people who owned the land in days before there were kings or Parliaments, armies or great cities. Here in the little island that the Acadian felt was small indeed he was suddenly faced by the mystery of the wild. He smelt it as he strode across the moor. He knew this mystery, this silence that underlay the buffet of the wind or the thrash of the rain or the cry of the curlew, a silence which is the mother of all natural sounds, a quietness of heart which is the gift and glory of Nature, but something which is only revealed to the few select and faithful souls who find in Nature a reality which is redolent of God. So he strode on and fancied he was at home; that the next bend of the billowy moor would bring him to a little ridge where the abundant pines guard a swift river where the salmon are, and hold a little clearing as an army might hold a little city, a little clearing where there are cattle and closed corn fields, and a home. So he strode on. He felt that a salmon river was near, and presently he saw it; saw, too, a stone house in a little farmstead. "This must be the place," he said to himself, "where the old cousins live. I never thought," he went on to himself, talking aloud as people talk who have lived alone in the wild. "I never thought that old England had anything so young in it. Greenwich is so old. In its Park the ghosts are

hustling one another. But here it is all as young as Acadia." So talking to himself he turned into the little farmstead just at sunset on this lovely April evening, when the thrush was thrilling in the purple hedge. As he went in a girl carrying a basket of primroses, a basket brimming with gold minted by Nature, came in behind him. He was so deep in thought that he never heard her. She laughed quietly to herself. "This",—said she, "this is Cousin James, for whom we have been looking." There was a light in one of the windows which seemed almost like a reflection of the sunset as it struck its last rays across the moor out of a cumulus which was a palace in heaven, a Placentia of the skies. He knocked with his stick on the door, three hearty knocks, and the loud knocking awakened him and brought him to himself. Presently there was a movement within, and some women's voices were heard speaking in broad accents. "It be not Mary, be it?" Then someone came to the door and opened it, a little old woman who looked as if she had come out of an old picture. Behind her there were standing two other old ladies who looked as if they, too, had stepped out of a picture, so neat and unperturbed were they. "Is this Miss Brayle's farm?" said the soldier stoutly, but not too stoutly, because he knew well enough that he was home at last. "I do believe that it be he, Susannah," said the first old lady. "Up and speak to he, Maria," said the second old lady. "I be sure it be he, Sarah." "Supper be ready if it be he," said Sarah; "it be ready if Mary be back." But no answer had been given to the waiting soldier. Then Mary intervened. "Be you James Brayle?" said she, "for if you be James Brayle I be your cousin Mary Brayle, and ready for supper, as I do not doubt you be." "Yes, I am James Brayle," said the soldier, "and . . ."

But before he could say more the first little old lady came up to him and pulled his face down to her and kissed it. She said no word. Then Maria came and kissed the bent head, and Sarah, bustling back from the kitchen, came and caught him by the ears, and pulled the head lower and kissed him tenderly. Then one old lady took one hand and another old lady the other, and they led him in, a damp-faced speechless warrior, to the great kitchen, and Sarah pushed him into a great flock chair. "There be thy gramfer opposite thee on the wall. Thou beest James Brayle right enough." And Mary, who knew her aunts and had been enjoying the scene, turned a lamp first on the Acadian and then on the wall. It might have been his veritable portrait. He had come home indeed. "Take hot water to the bedroom, Mary. He must not talk till he has washed and rested. The sheets be aired, James; they have been aired for days, James. Nay, do not speak. Go thee and wash." So the young man was led by ancient Sarah up a winding stair to a room that looked out west over the moor, and when he was alone he lay down on the bed, and first laughed and then (do not doubt it) cried like a child. He was at home. "My God," he sobbed, "home!"

He never will forget, among the sounds of his native waters or amid the snows and pines of his great and wonderful land, that evening; that Gargantuan feast of meats and hams and pasties and

cream and jams. He will remember the faded photographs, the old silver, the spotless cloth, the old paintings of Brayles dead and gone, and, above all, the yearning tenderness of the old ladies who had known his dead mother when she was a toddling girl on the moor, the old ladies who were full of talk, and snippets of song, and tender praise of fighting men. They treated him as a baby, as a little boy home from school, while Mary sat and smiled and listened. He seemed to himself suddenly to have come out of the riot and terrors of war into the quietness of a great and holy peace. It was worth fighting for, he thought. He was wrong when he said to himself that the moor was young. It was as old as Greenwich, and as full of ghosts. All homes are old and tender, but they beget youth, and this was his home, his link, as Greenwich was his nation's link, with the dear Motherland. The little old ladies beamed on him when he bade them good-night. "James," they said, "we have put a hot water bottle in your bed, and a lavender bundle under your pillow. Good-night, James." And Mary laughed and laughed like rippling water. It was good to listen to her laughing. James still heard her from his open window as he looked across the mystic moor at the westering moon.

J. E. G. DE M.

REVIEWS.

EASTERN EUROPE.*

At a time when so much ill-digested and second-hand information on European politics is flung at an unfortunate public, it is a pleasure to a reviewer to welcome such a scholarly and instructive work as Mr. Ralph Butler's "*The New Eastern Europe*." The complete collapse of three despotic empires has given the smaller nationalities an opportunity of self-realisation for which neither they nor their friends in the West ever dared to hope; but if that chance is not to be thrown away their frontiers must be fairly drawn and they must refrain from internal and external quarrels. The Great Powers, who have the fate of these young States in their keeping, can only discharge their responsibility if they understand the racial, linguistic, economic and religious conditions in each case. In the brief space of 163 pages they will find in broad outline the materials for their guidance. By travel, by linguistic achievements, by study of foreign sources, Mr. Butler has prepared himself for this difficult task. Most of the chapters have already appeared in the monthlies or quarterlies—some of them in the pages of this REVIEW; but they now form an organic whole, dealing with Finland, the Baltic Provinces, Lithuania, Poland, and the Ukraine, none of which can be profitably studied without reference to the rest.

* *The New Eastern Europe*. By Ralph Butler. (Longmans. 10s. 6d. net.)

The chapter on Finland, described as "the Fourth Scandinavian State," states the controversy with Russia with remarkable fairness, and proves the falsity of the notion almost universally held before the war that it was purely a quarrel of nationality. The class cleavage with its incredible bitterness was only revealed to the world when the Bolshevik Revolution kindled the conflagration; but we shall learn from these pages that it was no new phenomenon. Moreover, "Finland, though not in blood Scandinavian, is politically and geographically a part of Scandinavia. Russia will be the healthier for the excision of this non-Slavonic element; the two cannot live together. Finland will be the happier for standing alone. Scandinavia will gain in interest from the addition of a new half-brother of non-Teutonic race." The second chapter, devoted to the three Baltic Provinces, Esthonia, Livonia and Courland, ploughs up virgin soil, for, as the author reminds us, there were absolutely no sources of information in England relating to them. Over all three, as over all the subject territories of European Russia during the past half century, the shadow of Pan-Slavism hung like a cloud. Their history is the history of Russification and of the reactions to which it gave birth, culminating, after an abortive eruption in 1905, in the overwhelming upheaval of 1917. The problem of the provinces is complicated by the antagonism not only of Russian officials and German barons, but of German landowner and Lettish peasant. In this chapter, as throughout the book, the economic aspects are reviewed with a wealth of detail, and the dependence of politics on economics is clearly established.

Next on the list come the Lithuanians, a race which has had to struggle for life not only against Russians, but against Poles. "Russification in Lithuania was not so much directed against the Lithuanians as against the Poles. Few persons fifty years ago distinguished Lithuania from Poland. The nobles were Polish, the newspapers were Polish, the higher schools—till they were Russified—were Polish, the University of Vilna—while it existed—had been Polish." Had it not been for the clergy the memory of a written Lithuanian language—perhaps the oldest of Indo-European tongues—would have perished. But though the peasantry is strongly anti-Polish on social as well as racial grounds—for Pole means landlord—our author considers that the Lithuanians will not at present be able to dispense with Polish influence or compete with Polish culture. In the economic field, however, the Poles are but poor guides. A third of the race has been driven to the United States, the large estates are badly cultivated, and the Crown forests are the worst managed in Europe. It is a dark picture, and Lithuania starts on her new career with a heavier handicap than any of her neighbours.

None of the races surveyed in this volume receives such detailed discussion as the Poles, who both fascinate and irritate Mr. Butler. "The most uncertain factor for the future," he writes in a striking passage, "is Poland. The Poles are a baffling race. In all Europe there is no people, with the possible exception of the French, which is naturally so gifted. No one can study Eastern Europe without feeling that they are infinitely the most attractive of the

peoples with which he has to do. Yet in the political sphere their genius is strangely unfruitful. Their conceptions are brilliant; but they have no technique and do not see the need of it, and they never finish their work. Their resistance to outside pressure is amazing, but they seem unable to develop their own strength. To-day their captivity is over, and they are free to rebuild their fallen State. Yet they are rent by internecine quarrels: all their old imperialism has revived: and instead of betaking themselves to trowel and mortar, and with prayer and fasting each man labouring night and day at the foundations, they sit disputing among the ruins whether they shall ally themselves with Babylon or the Mede, while their trumpeters and shawm-players march in procession to all the cities of Philistia to proclaim, when their greatness is re-established, how great that greatness will be."

The survey closes with the Ukraine, which, our author believes, may one day rejoin the greater State from which it detached itself in the crisis of the war; "for Little Russia is one of All the Russias after all." Its desertion was a mortal blow, and provoked an instant collapse. "Not only do the Ukrainian provinces cover an area nearly equal to that of France, Italy, and England combined; not only do they contain the best part of the Black Earth Zone, the granary of Eastern Europe, most of the coal and iron, nearly all the oil, all the salt, 80 per cent. of the beet, 70 per cent. of the tobacco, one-third of the live-stock of all Russia, but they are bone of her bone and flesh of her flesh. They are pure Slav, pure orthodox: until a very few years ago no one would have hesitated to add, pure Russian." Even in 1905, the year of racial ferment, hardly a voice was raised in favour of separation. Despite, however, the close ties of blood and religion, the Ukrainian is different from the Russian—more individualist, caring less for the general well-being, more anxious of success. For this reason he has welcomed the Stolypin reforms and exchanged communal for individual ownership. "The commune is an institution very well suited to the Great Russian temperament, and very ill suited to the Ukrainian. The commune appeals to the fundamental belief, which is ingrained in the Great Russian, in the majesty of the whole and the insignificance of the unit. That belief forms no part of the Ukrainian character." How many people in England are aware of this important distinction and of other facts, vital to a comprehension of the new Eastern Europe, to which Mr. Butler calls our attention in his brilliant and informing pages?

G. P. G.

* * *

INTERNATIONAL SPIRITUAL SANCTIONS.*

It is interesting to bring together under one heading papers by two such apparently dissimilar minds as M. Loisy and Dr. Talbot

* (1) *The Spiritual Sanctions of the League of Nations*. By the Bishop of Winchester. (Oxford University Press. 3d. net.)

(2) *La Paix des Nations et La Religion de l'Avenir*. Par Alfred Loisy. (Emile Noury, 62, Rue des Ecoles, Paris.)

on a subject that has such far-reaching spiritual implications as a real League of Nations. The Bishop of Winchester, in his essay on "The Spiritual Sanctions of a League of Nations," declares that "those who see most what is at stake will be most desirous to convince themselves that there is indeed behind the movement the strength of those moral motives which ultimately prevail." We need something more than a mechanical improvement of the art, or science, of diplomacy. "We want a moral change, with a political development which will both answer to that change, and by exercise stimulate and strengthen it." Words and names will, of course, nor do this. The Holy Roman Empire was neither Holy, Roman nor Imperial. The Holy Alliance was neither Holy nor an Alliance. The League of Nations might prove to be no League and without national sanction.

Dr. Talbot does not mention the Holy Roman Empire nor the Holy Alliance, but he goes back to the real Empire and to the aspirations of Christianity. The Empire failed because of the slave-basis of the State, "its want of real citizenship," while we may add that Christianity as an organising force has hitherto failed, partly because of the political aspirations and ineptitude of Rome, and partly because of the infinite capacity for variations, the endless divisibility, of Protestantism. But Imperial Rome, as Dante has taught us, created for thinking men "an intuition of a true all-embracing State." Such a State was the goal at which the Dante of the *de Monarchia* aimed. Dr. Talbot sees in the process of Western history a trend towards larger systems. Rome was the first great experiment. After a dark interval we find the upgrowth of modern nations, and the growth of international law since the days of Grotius showed some feeling out towards the larger system. International law is a greater thing than perhaps the Bishop of Winchester thinks. It has been laying out the road of progress. Without it the idea of a League of Nations would remain as much an idea as in Dante's day, or as dangerous as the Greek Union of States. We do not agree that "the associations of the name are largely ironical," for it is the law that is about to punish war criminals and set out the basis of a real union. We agree that the name "stands for something of whose extent and reality the 'layman' can hardly judge." We have reached a stage, we are told, when "remembrance of the Empire and Christian aspiration make men feel for some more inclusive ideal, but vaguely and without effect." But the war has altered the pace of the trend.

"The War, in accustoming four great Powers and some twenty smaller ones to act together for a common cause, has been training its own antidote. And the increasing perception that such combinations must be used in the interests not only of the partners but of the world, gives to the combination double measure both of dignity and of *raison d'être*. Thus we are brought, by tracing political developments which have all of them constructive promise, to the patent need for a moral change which can supply binding power, and can quickly but steadily tune into a higher key of unity the current commonplaces and the accepted conventions and the accredited sentiments which have such power in human affairs."

The creative moral power that the war has discovered will meet this demand for a moral change. There is a new sense of service to a cause, an "increased satisfaction in the comradeship both of men and nations." Dr. Talbot shows us above these

"the revealed contrast, colossal and lurid, between two alternative Spirits or Ways. Against the Way which Germany (or the men who speak for her) has been persuaded to make her own, the way of selfishness, growing ever more brutal and ruthless, the other Way, the way of unselfishness, of common service and sacrifice, stands out in all the dignity and effectiveness of a true ideal."

The sense of this final issue between Christ and Anti-Christ became articulate and undeniable "when the great neutral Republic came in for the right under the guidance of its President." Dr. Talbot says that "the ideal has been declared once for all," and "it is perhaps to say the same thing in another way if we claim as a moral support of the League of Nations a quickened belief among us that there is behind the world a real meaning—a purpose with power." "For myself," Dr. Talbot concludes, "the issues of the future (and implicitly of the League of Nations) depend upon the consent of mankind to travel *Christo duce et auspice Christo*."

M. Loisy also feels that a great dramatic issue has been fought out:—

"C'était comme si deux âges, deux forces, deux esprits, deux formes de l'idéal humain, deux humanités avaient combattu l'une contre l'autre, sous l'impassible regard du ciel, pour la possession du monde : idéal de liberté contre idéal de domination, idéal de justice contre idéal de violence, idéal de bonté contre idéal de puissance, l'espérance ailée de l'avenir contre la pesanteur redoutable d'un passé qui ne voulait pas mourir."

M. Loisy also takes us to the Roman Empire, to the political processes of the Roman Church, to the mystical efforts of Protestantism, and finds that all these movements and organizations have led through the final mouldings of this "enormous war" to a true religion of humanity not based on imperialism or conquest. Fate has pronounced in favour of humanity, thanks to "l'immortel Wilson." It was—here M. Loisy is almost literally at one with Dr. Talbot—the entrance of the United States which "donnait décidément à la lutte son véritable caractère." This religion of humanity connotes "the mystical and moral element which enters into this ideal of human peace." Here again M. Loisy and Dr. Talbot are at one. Both demand and both discern a new moral element in human affairs which should revolutionise human relations whether of men or nations. But M. Loisy goes forward on other lines than those traced by Dr. Talbot. He looks forward to the new Jerusalem as a new earth coming down from heaven. He regards the religion of humanity as "the legitimate and well-born child of the Christian ideal," but he does not carry the soul much further. He would doubtless agree with Dr. Talbot that mankind must consent to travel with Christ as leader. But that is not his point. His future is essentially mundane, he looks for a transfigured earth.

But there he seems to stop; he seems to look no further than Comte looked. Yet if human society became perfect, it would be scarcely more tolerable than society as it is to-day, with all its possibilities of growth, if there were no certainty of a city in the heavens, not made with hands, to which we shall be admitted as citizens. Nothing less will satisfy the hungry soul of man.

* * *

ROME.*

It is always a pleasure to notice Mrs. Elizabeth O'Neill's books, they are so well and thoroughly done. The history of Rome is full of complexities, and it needs a clear mind and balanced judgment to disentangle the conflicting elements, fraught as they are with vital interest to the civilised world. The story of Rome is, in a measure, the story of the world, even unto these latter days, when once again she arose in all her strength to combat the Austrian and the Hun, driving from her land these ruthless, well-led invaders with feats of arms that surpass in prowess the imagination of man.

The record of Rome, with her wondrous past, rising from a sea of myth and fable, is truly a story of the Gods, and will for ever hold with fascination the mind of the student and the traveller. Without a knowledge of her history, she stands a ruined city and nothing more. But with Mrs. O'Neill's help one may conjure up the past, the rise, the decline, the fall from high estate, the rebirth, with all the possibilities of the future, the great men she has given to the world in art and letters, the statesmen and true patriots—no time or nation has produced greater—her struggle for freedom, undaunted by failure—"Who would be free themselves must strike the blow"—from Brutus to Garibaldi. In the darkest days, Rienzi, despite his faults, proved that Rome lived, and the almost miraculous career of Garibaldi in an age scarcely less dark proved the immortality of the Roman spirit. He rose to the height of a Joan of Arc, and, like her, crowned his achievement by hailing Victor Emmanuel as "King of Italy," thus bringing to pass his dream for the unity of the land for which he had fought and striven in heroic and marvellous fashion against untold odds. Such is the power and force of spirit over matter!

The ruins of Rome are indeed a memorial to her greatness, "sermons in stone" preaching to the world of to-day lessons we all need to remember. Even Ypres feels that no memorial that money or art would raise could so tell of her beauty and the iniquity of her destruction as the ruins of her past.

"While stands the Coliseum, Rome shall stand;
When falls the Coliseum, Rome shall fall;
And when Rome falls—the world."

Such was the prophecy of Saxon times, and Rome, rooted in

* *Rome: A History of the City from the Earliest Times.* By Elizabeth O'Neill. (T. C. & E. C. Jack Ltd. 5s. net.)

the past, still stands inviolate. In these last days, when Empires and Kingdoms have been weighed in the balance and found wanting, and the "Mene, mene" has been written in fire and blood, Italy, true to herself, stands firm, and in that truth her kingdom and her capital will endure—Rome, the Eternal.

S. DE M.

* * *

ROMANTIC LITERATURE.*

THESE seven essays carry the reader from "The Springs of Romance" in the eleventh century to the romantic revival with which the name of Sir Walter Scott is associated. We are carried through the autumn of the Middle Ages to the sound of the singing of Charles d'Orléans and the sad mad glad Villon to the spring-time of Ronsard and La Pléiade, and on to the summer of the Elizabethan age which in some fashion or another was still shining in the days of Scott, Byron, Shelley, and Keats. Some such book as this had been in Mr. Wyndham's mind. In a letter to his mother he wrote:—

"I remembered with regret the big book I meant to write about romantic literature, with a leaning towards the French. Then I began to remember all the things I have written, which I had forgotten. They are hidden away in *The New Review* (extinct) . . . and in introductions to books which are out of print or don't sell. Then it suddenly flashed on me that, without knowing it, I have written two-thirds or three-fourths of my book. And I see exactly what remains to be written."

The Chaucer chapter was not written, nor that on "The Chroniclers and the Crusades," nor the chapter on the new French Romantics, by whom, presumably, Mr. Wyndham meant Hugo and the Dumas. The finished essays Mr. Whibley has brought together, "a book planned by George Wyndham himself, marred by *lacunæ* which he would have filled up, but none the less complete in itself, and a fair picture of his mind and art." Mr. Whibley's introduction, itself a work of spirit and of art, gives the reader a vivid record of the lovable author of these brilliant essays. It is useless to regret that he gave up so much to public life, to rural life, to social life, and only left a residue for literature, since the literature that he gave us would not have been what it is had he lived a purely literary life. He loved and lived in the past, and brought it up into the present. He felt that tradition is indestructible, and that it creates a sense of duty. He could write: "The gentry of England must not abdicate," meaning that for every class the principle of *noblesse oblige*, the principle of inherited duties, is binding. A fox hunter, a politician, a worker at history, he

* *Essays in Romantic Literature*. By George Wyndham. Edited with an Introduction by Charles Whibley. (Macmillan. 12s. net.)

represented a sound English type, of which the mirror is to be found in hundreds of country houses where are excellent libraries dating from the eighteenth and earlier centuries, the libraries of men who combined sport, letters, and politics. But Mr. Wyndham was more than this. A literary hunger raised him above the cultured eighteenth century class. "Literature was for him no *παρεργον*, no mere way of escape from politics." He was something more than an archæologist, something greater than a student of literature. Great literature was literally alive to him, and he was by nature a poet rather than a scholar. Mr. Whibley says that "if he was an amateur in feeling, he was a craftsman in execution." We do not quite know what an "amateur in feeling" may be, but his judgment of literary questions is astoundingly sound, and if we may say so, sometimes more satisfying than that of his learned editor. Mr. Wyndham in his first essay, his Rectorial Address at Edinburgh in October, 1910, advanced "the disputable proposition that the writings preserved from Greece and Rome are not romantic; briefly, that the classics are not romantic." If these are the views of an "amateur in feeling," they are certainly shared by great classical scholars. Mr. Wyndham, of course, admits exceptional passages as romantic, "mainly in respect of the earliest and latest poems of the Classic world." Mr. Whibley holds very different views, and they are expressed with so great literary charm that we reproduce while disagreeing with them:—

"No definition of Romance can exclude from the enchanted kingdom a vast deal of Greek and Latin literature. It is not Nausicaa alone in the *Odyssey* that is romantic. Romance is the *Odyssey's* very texture and essence. The return of the wanderer, who after many years of miraculous dangers comes back to his wife and home is the theme of high romance. The hair of Odysseus is wet with the salt sea spray. Far distant havens and gallant ships have delighted his vision. The palace of Alcinoüs, in whose garden pear upon pear waxes old, and apple on apple and cluster ripens upon cluster of the grape, and fig upon fig, is in fairyland. And what a marvellous tale Odysseus has to tell! There is the story of Polyphemus, the giant who has but a single eye in the middle of his forehead, and who devoured two of the hero's companions at a meal. And the bewitchings of Circe and the Siren's song, and the soul-destroying lotus, and the dark houri of Hades itself—these are the very stuff of which romance is made. Nor does Homer stand alone. Virgil and Ovid were in the Middle Ages the great quickeners of romance. From them the romancers of the Middle Ages borrowed their passion; to them the ladies of high romance owed allegiance. And is not Lucian's 'True History' romantic, and 'Daphnis and Chloe'? And were there not witches in Thessaly when Apuleius wrote? For me, indeed, classic and romantic are terms which express neither time nor place. The two modes of thought, the two states of mind have lived, side by side, since the beginning of time. They were born, both of them in the Garden of Eden, and the Serpent was the first romantic."

This is all very attractive, especially the touch as to our old

enemy, a suggestion we are tempted to repudiate, as romanticists, with indignation. But in fact Mr. Whibley proves too much. It is quite true that the great classical stories "are the very stuff of which romance is made." They are in fact the stuff that the great mediæval and Elizabethan romanticists used wherewith to make romance. But they are not romance, save, as Mr. Wyndham points out, in exceptional cases. It is the soul of the romanticists that has turned wonderful narrative and great though formal verse into romance. Even Homer to the age for which he wrote was a pure narrator, and not a magician casting a new light on earth and sea. John Keats is an excellent example of the romanticists who read into the classics the glamour of their own spirit. That earlier ages have known the romantic spirit we are not prepared to deny. Folklore indeed makes this clear; but romanticism—that is the transforming force which gives a new reality to mundane things, and presents the essential beauties of every-day life in their highest atmosphere—romanticism as we understand it was born in the eleventh century, and sprang from that sense of aspiration which runs through the Anglo-French or, rather, Anglo-Norman Renaissance. The desire for knowledge, for growth, for beauty, for power, for holiness, combined to produce in the eleventh and twelfth centuries a unique condition in the outlook of the human race in the West, an outlook to which the East contributed much, and this condition was manifested in the various phases of romanticism in literature, art, learning and science. A not dissimilar Renaissance seems to be coming to-day, and we may anticipate new developments in Romance. Mr. Wyndham points out that, at the opening of the romantic period, all limitations of working concepts are brushed aside: "We find the most striking characteristic of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries in a huge attempt at unity throughout politics and literature, prosecuted by an all but universal comprehension. In that age political actors strove to weld Europe into one, assisted by literary authors who sought to correlate with that policy every known record of the Drama of Mankind." Mr. Wyndham, indeed, in a brief phrase, shows that in his view romanticism is a subjective thing. "Romance is . . . a result of welcoming the strange." We are not sure that that definition is adequate, but it, at any rate, puts the point that Romance represents a hunger or desire. That hunger can take an Alp or a Homer, and equally find in it or him Romance. The value of these essays is that they bring the reader into direct touch with the men who begat or formulated this hunger from age to age. And Mr. Wyndham has a literary gift that will carry the reader straight to those men, those singers. The only thing, we would say, is that Romance must not be confined to the poets and literature makers. Men of action, men of science, men of industry have been always chiefly great in the essential romanticism of their lives. Their lives also are Romance.

J. E. G. DE M.

THE NEAR EAST.*

Few books relating to the war combine so noticeably the qualities of lucidity of presentation, balance of judgment, and pertinent selection of relevant material as Mr. Charles Woods's volume on the relations of the Powers of the Near East to the Great War. Perhaps the only criticism that can be levelled at the form of the book is that, being built up from the notes from the Lowell Lectures of 1917-18, occasionally it gives the impression that the war is still at its height. Thus, in the chapter on "Roumania and the War," Mr. Woods writes: "Once more, therefore, an apparent concession, actuated for purely Pan-Germanic reasons, seems in progress of employment, for the sole purpose of developing and consolidating the Kaiser's dream of domination in the East." We venture to suggest that in future editions of a book likely to go into many editions, phrases of this kind should be modified, and the pure historical perspective secured. On one or two points of fact we venture also to make an addition to the information supplied as to the Baghdad Railway. The track of the line from Angora to Sivas was laid down in part during the war, but neither the line itself nor any part of it was completed as alleged in Mehrmann's *Diplomatischer Krieg in Vorder Asien*. The story of how and by whom the track was laid will one day surprise the world. The whole of this section of the book will need eventually recasting.

Mr. Woods has various designs in the book, and one of the chief is to prove that

"as the enemy has consistently worked for the establishment of Germanic control throughout the East, any peace which failed to put an end to the danger of the success of such an object, and any arrangement which would be ineffective in setting up an anti-German barrier there, must be condemned as entirely unsatisfactory from the Allied and American standpoint."

This is one of the chief goals aimed at in this masterly narrative of facts, which make it clear enough that "for years, the Central Powers have worked not for stable government, but for unrest in the East."

Mr. Woods was convinced before the publication of the evidence given by *The Times*, on July 28th, 1917, and by the narrative of Mr. Morgenthau, sometime American Ambassador to Turkey, that a decision was arrived at in Germany early in July, 1914, to begin the war. The decision immediately followed on the opening of the Kiel Canal:—

"No doubt has ever existed in my mind that the Austrian ultimatum, delivered at Belgrade on July 23rd, 1914, was actually concocted in Berlin within a week of the murder of the Archduke, and that no amends on the part of Serbia for an atrocity for which her Government at least was not responsible, would have affected the course of events, which were definitely planned in Berlin two

* *The Cradle of the War: the Near-East and Pan-Germanism*. By H. Charles Woods, F.R.G.S. (Lecturer before the Lowell Institute, 1917-1918), with Foreword by H. Laurence Lowell, President of Harvard University. (John Murray. 12s. net.)

or three weeks before any mobilization measures were taken in France, Russia, or Great Britain."

The chapter on "Turkey and the War" is particularly important. As the result of the Balkan wars Turkey and Bulgaria "had suffered in a manner which naturally made these countries of greater importance to and brought them into closer sympathy with one another." Both were ardent enemies of Greece, and the co-ordination of their action was to be looked for. Was it in fact looked for and guarded against by the Entente statesmen? That is one of the practical questions which arise out of the history of the early stages of the war. Had we sufficiently intelligent men surveying the position? Mr. Woods hardly touches this point, but his narrative raises incidentally these vital questions. That England was ill-served by her diplomatists in the Near East is beyond doubt true. In dealing with Greece, Mr. Woods, though writing obviously before the close of the war, clearly indicates the future which

"depends not so much upon the fighting value or importance of the Greek Army, as upon the statesmanship, the moderation, and the good will of a man who has already saved his country in more than one time of crisis, and upon the capacity and ability of the Allies to help and to allow this man to work out the destiny of his country in such a way as to regain his prestige at home and to further the interests of his own people, and also those of a group of countries who are fighting for the protection of small nationalities, and for the overthrow of militarism."

The principle still applies. Greece is looking for a great future on the continent of Asia. It is an ambition fraught with great danger, and nothing but statesmanship and moderation can prevent that ambition leading to many international difficulties. Greece will need all the restraints and patience that the statesmanship of her great Cretan can devise.

Finally, we must note Mr. Woods's view that Italy should become the protecting Power who will maintain the unity and independence of all Albania, unless the task is undertaken by Great Britain or the United States of America. He feels that some Albanian patriots will object to this, but

"those men will do well to remember that in addition to helping them to establish good government and to develop their country, the protection of Italy would provide them with a powerful friend—a friend without whom they might be helpless not only to enlarge, but even to maintain their present frontiers."

SHORTER REVIEWS.

It is a pity that the late Mr. G. W. E. Russell's entertaining volume, "Prime Ministers and Some Others: A Book of Reminiscences" (T. Fisher Unwin, 12s. 6d. net), is not printed on better paper, but the charm of the book will make the reader forget the repellent medium. Here we

read of Lord Palmerston, the earliest of Mr. Russell's memories. He was born a Tory, and never became a Whig except in name, and indeed the Whigs thought him no gentleman. But Pam's virtues were greater than the Whigs thought. He may have been a dog, but he was certainly a bull-dog. It is difficult to think that he was living as recently as October 15th, 1865. Mr. Russell's uncle, Lord John Russell, is well described here, a true reformer and a lover of the people. But he was conservative to the core: "in principles, beliefs, opinions, even in tastes and habits he was singularly unchanging." He lived to the age of eighty-six, Palmerston to the age of eighty-one. Prime Ministers have charmed lives. Lord Derby died young at the age of seventy. Mr. Russell is scarcely just to "the strange and sinister figure of the great Disraeli," but he adequately reflects the bitterness with which his great success was received by men who talked much about "political honour," but did very little for the democracy whom they were supposed to represent. Mr. Russell shows us Disraeli in 1867 towering above Lord Salisbury, John Bright, Robert Lowe, Gathorne Hardy, Bernal Osborne, Goschen, Mill, Kinglake, Henley, Horsman, Coleridge. It is not fair to call him "sinister." He was a great fighter and a great romanticist, and he won his battles gallantly. Mr. Russell says that "his profile was not in the least what we in England consider Semitic. He might have been a Spaniard or an Italian, but he was certainly not a Briton." He was, of course, in fact, a scion of a Spanish family of Jewish stock. He was, we are told, "entitled to all the credit which he got, for it was his genius that first saw the possibilities hidden in a Tory democracy." The account of Gladstone is acid, though on the whole just, and it was right to print Disraeli's tribute to Gladstone after the downfall of 1874. The account of Lord Salisbury is, to say the least, friendly. "He was exactly what he called Gladstone, 'a great Christian statesman.'" Lord Rosebery will not find the sketch of his life consoling. In Mr. Balfour the Irish Party "found, for the first time, a master," but as a Prime Minister in this description we seem to see a twin phantom to Lord Rosebery. A merited tribute is paid to Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, though "the first freshness of 1906 had been wasted on a quite worthless Education Bill." The essays on great ministers are followed by accounts of friends such as H. M. Butler, and some general essays. The book as a whole is full of charm, with some of the stinging flavours that good critics have in their laboratory.

* * *

Professor Joseph Barthélemy's new volume entitled "*Le Problème de la Compétence dans la Démocratie*" (Paris, Librairie Félix Alcan, 108, Boulevard Saint Germain, 6 francs) is one that demands close study at the present time. Competence in government has been revealed as a necessity by the war. The day of the amateur is dead. We need inspired, highly trained men and women for the business of government. We have to face a difficult antinomy: while democracy needs simplicity of exposition and leaders who can explain the complex in terms of the simple, yet democratic government is an intensely technical business. Professor Barthélemy lays stress on this antinomy, and points out that following the many experiments of the war the most actual of problems is the estimation of the competence of the State to deal with economic problems. But in reality this turns on the competence, and of course the honesty, of the individual administrators. The State is not a thing in itself, a thing to be worshipped. That was the German error, and we see to-day whither it has led. The State is the machinery of government worked by men and women. That machinery is often singularly

incompetent, and that incompetence is due to the incompetence of men and women. If this is true the student of social matters will turn to this volume which discusses the competence of simple citizens, who are the electors and are the base of the State, the competence of legislators (law and law-making is a highly technical thing that should not be left to the amateur), the competence of ministers of State who too often are both unstable and incompetent. The goal to aim at is the choice of the best and the most apt for public functions. The word "specialist" is merely a word. Many a specialist on many a subject is incompetent or dishonest or both. What is wanted is such an educational and constitutional system as will produce a high standard of competence all round, and will tend to bring the man or woman best suited for a special duty into the position to fulfil that duty. Professor Barthélemy's book discusses the difficulties in the way of such a result, and many modern experiments.

* * *

Dr. E. Hershey Sneath, the professor of the philosophy of religion and religious education at Yale, has edited a series of essays on the war and reconstruction entitled "Religion and the War" (Yale University Press, Oxford University Press, 4s. 6d. net), by professors of the University of Yale. In the opening essay on "Moral and Spiritual Forces in the War," Dr. C. R. Brown writes: "The very conscience of the country has put on khaki. The moral sense of the whole nation has become militant." Professor D. C. Macintosh declares that "it is perhaps still possible for the race to learn enough from this period of strife and carnage for the resultant good to outbalance the total evil." Professor F. C. Porter writes: "We know that the ruthless sacrifice of individuals for the abstract idol called the State is a denial of Christ's reverence for the human personality." Professor L. A. Weigle, writing upon the effect of the war on religious education, declares that "for a century German education has been at work to breed the present war-menace. The German schools have made the German people what they are. . . . They have set children in vocational grooves and moulded them to pattern. They have educated the few to exert authority, and have trained the many to obey. They have nurtured the young upon hatred of other peoples. . . . We have been following false gods, therefore, in so far as we have sought to shape ourselves upon German models." He writes again: "Religious education after the war will be more democratic, more immediately concerned with life, more fully Christian," and he looks for a "strengthening of family ties and a renewal of family religion."



NOTICES OF BOOKS.

We must record the publication by the Indian Government of the seventh quinquennial review of the "Progress of Education in India, 1912-1917," by H. Sharp, C.S.I., C.I.E. (Calcutta, 5s. 6d.). Mr. Sharp draws attention to the very curious fact that while the percentage of population enjoying elementary education is the lowest in any civilised country, the percentage of males enjoying University education is little below the German or English percentage. This position seems to us to be a very dangerous one, since the University class will be able to sway the lower classes along lines that may be destructive to ordered rule.

India needs and must secure an educated democracy. The war has delayed educational advance, and has checked the inflow of teachers from England, but public interest in education has increased, though public opinion is still crude or unformed. It is satisfactory to know that "a not unimportant section of the Press has, during the quinquennium, approached educational questions in the spirit of the educator."

* * *

Mr. C. Ernest Fayle has prepared for the Garton Foundation, under the title "The Fourteenth Point: A Study of the League of Nations" (John Murray, 5s. net), a treatise which, after preliminary essays on the nature of the problem, the community of nations, the dangers of premature organisation, sets out certain "suggestions for a Treaty" intended to secure that "the standard of public right approved by the common will of the community of nations shall prevail in international affairs as against the rule of force." To secure this the Council of the League must be in a position effectively to forbid the use of arms except in cases where it cannot recommend a settlement by peaceful means of the dispute. In other words, there must be administrative force available. Force is not the ultimate sanction of laws, but it is the administrative or intermediate sanction. The scheme for a League set out here is simple, and should be considered by the delegates in Paris. It has many points in common with the scheme recently issued by the Conference, and "the open door" for purposes of international commerce is an admirable proposal, one that would lead to universal Free Trade. But what is equally necessary is a common standard of labour laws. There cannot be freedom of trade if one nation can undercut another by cheap labour and long hours.

* * *

The Abbé Daniel, in "Le Baptême de Sang: histoire d'un complot au Vatican contre La France" (Albin Michel, 22, Rue Huyghens, Paris, 4 fr. 50) tells the world a desperate story about the Vatican. We read how Cardinal Puzyan in the name of Francis-Joseph vetoed the election of Cardinal Rampolla to the papal chair, and how Sarti became Pope Pius X. The Abbé goes on to describe what he calls "l'œuvre anti-française du Cardinal Merry del Val," and sets forth an indictment which we have no means of checking, but which, as a *prima facie* statement, will no doubt receive in due course adequate rebuttal from the Cardinal, if he considers it worth while. The suggestion that Cardinal Rampolla, in December, 1913, that the saintly Pius X., in August, 1914, that Cardinal Ferrata in October, 1914, were poisoned for political reasons seems to us absurd. We are no longer in the days of the Renaissance, and the book reads like a vivid novel of those times.

* * *

It is only right that this "Life of Viscount Rhondda" (H. R. Allenson, Ltd., Racquet-court, 114, Fleet-street, 10s. 6d. net) by the Rev. J. Vyrnwy Morgan, D.D., should be given to the world at once. Lord Rhondda did yeoman service for England and the Empire in the darkest days of the war, when the German submarine threatened the life of the Empire. David Alfred Thomas, the grandson of a yeoman farmer and the son of an acute shopkeeper and colliery owner, who was born on March 26th, 1856, combined the sense of reality and the sensitive qualities of his ancestors. A delicate lad, he nevertheless made his mark in athletics at Cambridge, and would have done the same in mathematics had his health permitted. Always a man of character as well as capacity he became a leader in the colliery world and did great things for the coal trade. His vast capacity was not, however, taken advantage of by

any Government, though he was in the House of Commons from March 14, 1888, until the great need of the nation during the war set statesmen looking for a new type of worker. Mr. D. A. Thomas was one of the obvious selections. He was an all round man with peculiar aptitudes for business on a great scale, and he possessed great courage and power of decision. So he became Food Controller. He had little love for the Germans and fought them successfully in trade before the war, and went through the experience of being saved, with his daughter, from the wreck of the *Lusitania*. His chief fight against Germany was as Food Controller. He won that fight; but the struggle of the last few years had been great and he died on July 3rd, 1918. Certainly he was a victim of the war, but he lived long enough to see that the end was beyond doubt, and he knew that he had done much to secure the victory of Right.

* * *

Mr. Henry H. Slessor in "The Nature of Being: An Essay on Ontology" (George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 10s. 6d. net) points out that "Things ontologically resolve themselves into Substance and Will" while the predicate of knowledge resolves itself "into three irreducible elements: a Knower to whom all knowledge is presented, Substance, and Will." Those who propose a mechanical solution of the Universe do not seem to recognise that Self is immune from casual analysis, that the Knower and the Will which together make Being cannot be brought within conceptional knowledge. The Self is not the creature of Event at all. This explains why "While the Self knows intellectually that his actions are determined, he feels that they are free." There is logical Truth and a logical fact that these have to be combined in a higher unity of Being which resolves the final dualism of the rational and the super-rational. We must therefore premise Being beyond Knowledge. The book is a severe piece of metaphysical thinking, which cannot be summarised here: the value of it is that it takes the student out of the vicious circle of the mechanical solution of the Universe.

* * *

Mr. James Brown Scott, the Director of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, has done useful work in printing "The Treaties of 1785, 1799, and 1828, between the United States and Prussia" (Oxford University Press, 8s. 6d. net). These Treaties affect, or affected, the international relations of Germany and the United States of America. Though they were contracted before the days of either the late North German Confederation, of which Prussia was the leading member, or of the late German Empire, of which the King of Prussia was Emperor, they were adopted by the Confederation and the Empire successively. The Treaties were suspended or abrogated by the war, with the exception of Articles xxiii. and xxiv. of the Treaty of 1799, which specially deal with the eventuality of war and provide for the departure of the respective nationals to their own countries and for the humane treatment of prisoners of war. Neither of these Articles were observed by the Germans. It is interesting to note that in the case of the "Appam," a British ship captured early in 1916 by German naval forces and carried into Norfolk by a prize crew, the Germans claimed under Article xix. of the Treaty to keep the "Appam" in American waters until further notice. The American Government held that Article xix. was not applicable: "To grant limited asylum in a neutral port to a prize accompanied by the capturing vessel, is not the granting of a right of

'laying up' in a neutral port a prize which arrives in the control of a prize-master and crew." These Treaties should now be formally abrogated. They answered no useful purpose before or during the war, and are anachronistic in these changed times.

* * *

In "Educational Plans for the American Army Abroad" (Association Press, New York) we have the reports presented to and approved by General Pershing, with supplementary reports by Professor John Erskine, of Columbia University, and Professor R. A. Daly, of Harvard. At the present time, when education in the Army is playing a very important part in the changes that are taking place in our social life, those who are engaged in the work will find much help in these practical essays. Happily, the educational plan intended to operate during actual military operations is no longer needed, but the "Plan for Work during Demobilisation" merits very close attention. "It is hoped . . . that the military arrangements for instruction will be such that no member of the A.E.F. will return to America without a knowledge of reading and writing English, and of the elements of American History and Government." We wish that some such rule could be imposed in France, and that the men there were so trained that they could return to this country with a knowledge of speaking, reading, and writing French. The Americans looked for the co-operation of the French Education Authorities and secured it. Have our military educators done the same? They have certainly not sufficiently secured in England the co-operation of the English Educational Authorities. But in this respect some progress is being made. The Army in England should form the first adult continuation schools and these schools should survive the period of demobilisation.

* * *

These last essays by Mr. Henry James ("Within the Rim," W. Collins, 6s. net) will be read with a sympathy deepened by the fact that this great figure in modern literature assumed British citizenship in order to show his deep sympathy for the sacrifices that our nation was making for civilisation. These essays of 1914-1915 are a tribute to the efforts made on both sides of the Atlantic, and show us an enemy exhibiting "the insolence of his dream and the depth of his delusion." He shows us too, France "bleeding at every pore, while at no time in all her history so completely erect," and we feel that she is "perhaps as never before our incalculable immortal France."

* * *

Dr. Vincent A. Smith, C.I.E., has now published under the title "The Oxford History of India from the Earliest Times to the End of 1911" (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press. 12s. 6d. net.) This monumental history of India, which runs into nearly 800 pages of closely-printed, clear type. The volume is on Indian paper, and is of handy shape. We hope to return to it, for it is a volume that has occupied the author for nearly half-a-century. The characteristic notes are claimed to be "scrupulous accuracy of statement and impartiality of judgment." This balance is shewn clearly in modern questions, such as the use of English in Indian education.

THE PEACE CONFERENCE: AN ESTIMATE OF FORCES.

THE Peace Conference opened three months ago in an atmosphere of hope. In the eyes of the democratic nations of the world it was a gateway leading to a new world order, free from the ambitions and conflicts which had troubled the peace of Europe throughout history. The justification for this high expectation lay in the conditions on which the Armistice was signed. President Wilson's Fourteen Points, voicing principles rather than expounding a definite policy, dominated the situation; and the onlooking world, taking too little account of certain conflicting forces within the Conference itself, looked for a speedy realisation of the democratic ideals enshrined in the declaration of the American President.

Three months have passed, the new world order is not yet in being; and the bright vision of a new Europe has already grown dim. But the reaction of pessimism which has set in, must not blind us to certain substantial achievements, nor must it lead us to despair of the future because the gate leading to it has proved so hard to open. Let us rather look at the nature of the task, at the conditions under which it is being performed, at the agents engaged in it, and then ask ourselves whether the world has not gained a definite promise of better things as the result of the Conference of Paris.

The nature of the task is well known. It was nothing less than the reconstruction of Europe on foundations of freedom and the establishment of a partnership between the nations which should exorcise the evil spirit that breeds war. The conditions under which the task was undertaken are equally plain to all. Half of Europe lay in ruins; the other half was maimed and exhausted by war; and over the entire continent a spirit of unrest brooded, descending here and there to add the horrors of civil war to the desolation created by invading and retreating armies. To lay durable foundations and upon them to build a new world order in such circumstances would have taxed the sagacity and courage of any congress, even if it were guided by a complete unity of purpose and inspired by unfailing goodwill. In Paris, these two requirements were often lacking for the agents engaged in the Conference assembled in January with widely different conceptions of their task. Therefore no estimate of the Conference would be complete without an account of the forces at work within it.

For practical purposes I restrict my examination of the component parts of the Conference to the four principal Powers engaged in it—the United States, France, Great Britain, and Italy. Geography, history, and political tradition combined to give each of these four a different outlook on international affairs while uniting them in their conceptions of domestic government. In their varying ways they were all democratic in structure and subscribed to Lincoln's famous definition of representative government. But only in the United States had these liberal conceptions

found full expression in war aims. The United States, alone of all the belligerents, came into the war and subsequently entered the Peace Conference untrammelled by any agreement or treaty which conflicted with the new international liberalism expounded by President Wilson. But this very freedom from entanglements implied a detachment from the Old World which practically amounted to ignorance of many essential things in Europe; and therefore the American people and their representatives in Paris had further to travel than any of the Allied peoples in their attempt to apply Wilsonian principles to European situations. In particular, it needed something like a revolution in the psychology of the average American to enable him to get into the skin of a Frenchman and appreciate his acute anxiety for his vulnerable eastern frontier. France thus in some ways presented a complete contrast in mentality to America. A whole generation of Frenchmen still alive had seen the German invader harrying northern France twice in the space of some forty years, and to the vast majority of them and of their younger fellow-countrymen the foreign policy of France was and is summed up in the one word *security*. To them war is not the somewhat distant horror which it appears to British and American minds; least of all is it the "great and perilous adventure" which so strongly appeals to the chivalrous youth of England; it is a blow at the heart which must be parried and returned before France can breathe again. Thus the Frenchman conceives safety in terms of his eastern frontier and in no other. The *idée fixe* fills his mind, gives it an orientation which is unfavourable to the new conception embodied in the League of Nations and impels him to demand a peace treaty which will give him the kind of guarantee which his military chiefs prescribe. It has therefore been one of the principal tasks of the Conference—in which it has not wholly succeeded—to convince France that the League can provide a genuine coalition for defence against the aggressor, and that if this coalition of defence can be brought into existence *before* any crisis arises the crisis itself will not lead to war. And Frenchmen should note that the issue at stake is not whether, once the French frontier is crossed, the League can save eastern France from devastation, but whether in the face of overwhelming odds the presumptive invader will dare to cross the frontier at all. Partisans of the League are convinced that—whichever he may be—he will not.

This brief sketch of the American and French factors reveals something of that dual personality in the Conference to which I refer below. The British Delegation introduces a third factor; for while British public opinion espoused the Wilsonian programme from the very outset, British Ministers were faced with the task of reconciling it with the existing obligations of the British Commonwealth. British policy was and is a compromise between Liberalism and moderate Imperialism. Security is a naval term in Great Britain, just as it is a military term in France; but the growing bent of the British mind towards Liberalism in international as well as in domestic affairs (I use Liberalism not in the party sense) enabled us to see the implications of the League of Nations in European

affairs and to take the long view which reveals the policy of the League as the only ultimate security. *A priori* one might have said that the British part in the Conference would be that of compromise between American Idealism and French Realism, and so it has, in fact, proved on many occasions during the past three months—though in the main British influence has been exerted in favour of solutions congenial to the new Liberalism. In practice this has meant that Mr. Lloyd George and President Wilson have been harmonious co-operators in the main tasks of the Conference.

This Anglo-Saxon harmony came as a surprise to the Italians, who bring yet another factor to the composition of the Conference. A study of the Italian Press during the first four weeks of the Conference reveals the fact that both the official Italian delegation and the majority of Italian journalists came to Paris under the belief that the mainspring of the Conference would be the Franco-British Entente working on the old lines of diplomatic bargaining and paying no more than lip-service to the ideals of President Wilson. They were thoroughly nonplussed by the discovery that the American President wielded a powerful influence, indeed, a decisive influence, on the early decisions of the Conference, and that Great Britain cordially supported him. And they found themselves at a most serious disadvantage owing to the fact that Baron Sonnino's policy, being based upon the purest *ancien régime* diplomacy, simply could not be reconciled with the proposals of President Wilson. The Italian Foreign Secretary had convinced himself that there would still be a Habsburg Monarchy to treat with in peace negotiation and had taken the utmost care not to compromise himself with the subject peoples of Austria-Hungary, especially with the Southern Slavs. His policy was based on the assumption that Germany and Austria would still be strong enough at the end of the war to maintain the semblance of a balance of power and that it would be unwise of Italy to close every door that might lead back to the Triple Alliance. But the disruption of Austria and the German Revolution destroyed this nicely-balanced plan, and the author of it came to Paris wholly unprepared for the new situation created by President Wilson's influence at the Conference. His only hope lay in linking his annexationist demands to those which he presumed France would make and, so to speak, to smuggle Dalmatia into Italy as the price of Italian support of a French Rhine. But though he received some support for his project from the Quai d'Orsay, it broke down because M. Clemenceau had no thought of flouting America and Great Britain on any such perilous issue. The result of Baron Sonnino's policy has been to rob Italy of her due influence and to place one of the most democratic and liberal-minded nations in Europe in the unenviable position of appearing to repudiate the noble and historic traditions of her own *Risorgimento*. Within the limits of this policy, however, the Italian delegation has displayed constructive qualities which prove that under more liberal leaders the Italian people can and will play a beneficent rôle in the politics of south-eastern Europe.

A Conference composed of these four elements, with other

distracting forces playing around it, could not fail to encounter grave difficulties in its task. It was the foreknowledge of these difficulties which made President Wilson insist that the League of Nations must form the pivot of the whole treaty of peace. A prior agreement upon it, he argued, would provide the Conference with guiding principles for all future decisions and would thus give its deliberations a much-needed unity of purpose. His success in carrying his proposal has already been related by General Maurice (CONTEMPORARY REVIEW, March, 1919) in a lucid article which gives a full account of the machinery of the Conference and of its first discussions of policy. From the point of view of a good European these discussions were eminently satisfactory and gave some promise that the essential spirit of the League of Nations would inspire the ultimate treaty. And those who knew the *personnel* of the various Commissions on territorial problems realised that liberal solutions would not lack stalwart advocates. But even in the atmosphere of goodwill and optimism which prevailed during the first three or four weeks of the Conference there were some reasons for misgiving. The most critical questions—such as the Franco-German frontier and the Adriatic—had been left untouched and it was felt in many quarters that the real test of Conference statesmanship had thus been postponed.

Such was the general position when President Wilson sailed for America in the middle of February. While he was on the high seas the world was startled by the attempt to assassinate M. Clemenceau (February 19th) and for a short time anxiety for the French Premier's life combined with President Wilson's absence to reduce the activity of the Conference. But behind the scenes the work of the Commissions proceeded apace, so that by the time of the President's return several of them had completed their reports. Despite the fact, however, that some of the best work of the Conference was accomplished during this period, a mood of profound pessimism reigned over Paris. The first impulse, which had reached its climax in the presentation of the draft Covenant of the League of Nations (February 14th), had exhausted itself and the strain imposed on all the delegations by daily spade-work was beginning to tell. The Conference began to understand the truth of the prophecy made before the Armistice that "the peace would be as arduous as the war." And as the Council of Ten, both informally and in its formal sessions, came to grips with the thornier problems of policy it seemed almost to have lost its belief in a "good peace," and to be waiting for some new impulse from without.

For a moment, when Mr. Lloyd George returned from London to give the Conference a dramatic lead on the question of German disarmament, it seemed as though the cloud of pessimism had lifted; but neither his fillip nor the return of the President on March 14th brought the desired revival of spirit. Some said that Paris needed fresh air and that greater publicity would help the Conference by opening it to the influence of democratic public opinion. But those who knew their Paris—and especially those who knew the Paris Press—were quick to point out that, at so

critical a moment, mere publicity would only increase the confusion of voices without giving any compensating benefit of public guidance to the perplexed negotiators. It must also be remembered that at this very moment when publicity was being prescribed as the cure for pessimism the British Press had ears for nothing but the ominous sound of industrial trouble. Though I have advocated greater publicity throughout the entire period of the Conference, especially in the form of those lucid explanations of policy which Lord Robert Cecil used to give weekly to American correspondents during the war, I am convinced that the trouble in Paris had a deeper origin than the comparative reticence of the Council of Ten or, subsequently, of the Council of Four.

The root cause of the trouble lay in the failure of the Allied Governments to explore the whole field of peace problems before the Armistice and to attempt to reach common ground on the major questions raised by the war. Independent observers in Parliament and in the Press were at pains frequently to draw the attention of the Government to the plain fact that unless the Allies took counsel together regarding the terms of peace they would find themselves fully as unprepared for the task of European reconstruction as they had been for the war itself. President Wilson's famous exposition of policy in the Fourteen Points made the co-ordination of Allied war aims more urgent than ever, and plainly called for a prolonged, intimate, and informal exchange of views. At that moment there was still time for leisured discussion which would have revealed and probably removed those very difficulties which have all but paralysed the Peace Conference during the past few weeks. Had this process been set on foot immediately after America declared war the problem of French security, for instance, would have more fully been understood in Anglo-Saxon countries and the new conceptions embodied in the League of Nations would have had time to penetrate French minds.

Here we strike the root of all the difficulties which beset the Conference. On the one side the influence of the past, with its bitter memories of two invasions, presses upon the French mind and drives it to demand concrete securities of a familiar kind—in alliances and military guarantees expressed in "strong frontiers"; on the other side the call of the future demands a complete break with the old tradition. In that antinomy lies the dual personality of the Conference. It accounts for all the serious difficulties which at one moment made progress so slow and in the end will give the world a treaty of peace which will, I fear, fall short of the ideal charter for a new Europe.

Such are some of the general features of the situation. One more remains to be mentioned before I attempt to estimate the achievements of the Paris Conference. I have pointed out that the Conference has a dual personality, being at once the Dr. Jekyll of the New Order and the Mr. Hyde of the Old. It has also a dual character inasmuch as it is both a legislative body engaged in giving Europe a new Constitution and an executive body trying to administer a continent in turmoil. Either task would tax the energies of the men engaged, and it is therefore little surprising

that the attempt to discharge both simultaneously has created doubts regarding their capacity as statesmen. The Russian situation is the supreme instance in which the Conference has aroused criticism of its executive capacity. But the bad Press which the Council of Four has had on this subject is more to be regarded as an indication of the baffling nature of the problem than of the bankruptcy of Western statesmen. The first requisite of fruitful action is lacking, namely, accurate information; and the only effective criticism which can be levelled at the Council of Four is that it has not taken all the means at its disposal to supply the defect. But even if more information had been sought I have serious doubts whether definite action could have been taken, for the very good reason that the political attitude of the Russian people—if they have one—is not to be gauged by any touring commission but can only be revealed by spontaneous movements of public opinion. In so far as there are such movements to-day in Russia they are contradictory. It is therefore little surprising that the cooler heads in Paris are not ashamed to confess that they are “agnostics on Russia”; nor is it to be wondered at that the action of the Conference in Russian affairs has been so halting. At present the only positive policy which seems to have any life in it is that of revictualling Russia (or, at least, Petrograd) by a neutral commission consisting of Dr. Nansen, Mr. Branting, and others under certain strict guarantees.

* * * * *

In the foregoing account I have expressly ignored all minor events in order to throw into greater relief the essential features of the Conference. The historian of these three eventful months will have to gauge hereafter the effect of many things which find no place in this brief estimate of its work. Such things as (a) the concurrent controversy on the League of Nations in America which forced President Wilson to propose, and the Conference to accept, a clause safeguarding the Monroe doctrine; (b) the Smuts mission to Budapest the origin and the results of which are still both obscure; (c) the influence of domestic preoccupations upon Mr. Lloyd George's policy; these are but three out of a multitude of questions which played no inconsiderable part in the daily round of the Conference, but which I leave for discussion elsewhere. Similarly, in the following closing summary I do not attempt to recite the details of the treaty of peace but rather to show where expectations have been realised and where they have been disappointed.

If it were true that, in Mr. Lloyd George's singularly infelicitous phrase, we have only succeeded in “Balkanising Europe,” we should indeed have waged war and made peace in vain. Fortunately, it is not true; and it is still too soon to say what aspect Europe will wear when the nervous tension of to-day has been relaxed. The ferment of nationalism is still seething all over Eastern Europe—and elsewhere nearer home!—and as long as this aftermath of war lasts Europe cannot settle down to put her house in order. The spirit of the age is responsible for all this, not the Peace Conference; but the Council of Ten is responsible for aggravating the

trouble by its failure to realise early enough that the revictualling of Europe was the indispensable first step towards peace and order. No one could spend five minutes in Mr. Hoover's company without realising that lack of food was one of the chief sources of European disorders, and that the Allies had gravely complicated their own task by their delay in supplying it. If Europe is being "Balkanised" hunger is one of the agents. Another grave factor in the process is to be found in the unsatisfactory situation created by the armistice in all those numerous regions in Central and Eastern Europe which are the objects of dispute between different nationalities. Each of these areas should have been occupied by the Allies at once and garrisoned by American troops. Had this been done there would probably have been no Bolshevism in Hungary, fewer collisions between Italians and Jugo-Slavs, and a more amicable feeling between the Czechs and the Poles. The failure to do it is one of the chief causes of our disappointments.

The general lines of the territorial settlement proposed by the Conference have thus been drawn under unfavourable conditions. The dead hand of the past—both near and remote—has been laid heavily on our new map-makers and has gravely complicated their difficult task. With the best will in the world the Territorial Commissions simply could not draw frontiers on strict lines of nationality nor could they ignore vital economic considerations; and the almost inextricable mosaic of nationalities forbade the resort to a *plébiscite* in some of the most critical cases. In the Banat, for instance, a *plébiscite* taken over the whole area as one unit would bring Roumania practically to the gates of Belgrade and would incorporate a large Serbian minority in the Roumanian kingdom, while a *plébiscite* restricted to the most hotly contested central part would simply reveal the already well-known mingling of Serbs, Roumans, Magyars and Germans. The Commission has, therefore, been driven to draw the new frontier in such a way as to reduce the minorities on either side of it to a minimum, and at the same time to respect vital economic requirements in the existing lines of communication by road, rail, and river. The principle here applied to a small though thorny problem has been faithfully observed in practically all the conclusions of the various commissions; yet results will certainly arouse criticism both from Liberals and from frontier experts. But the critics may reasonably be asked to say where the alternative lies. Given the prior condition that the new frontiers must follow ethnical lines, the strategists' criticisms have only a limited validity; and only the veriest doctrinaire will cavil at the inclusion of certain national minorities within alien States. Let me press the point further and ask Liberal supporters of a united Ireland why, for instance, German-Bohemians should not remain in the new Czech State if Ulster is to remain united to the rest of Ireland. True, the conditions under which either minority can be happy are the same in both cases; and all the critic can say is to express his fears of Czech oppression—against which, I believe, the dictates of self-interest will ultimately prevail in Prague.

Now, the gravamen of the charge that we are "Balkanising Europe" lies in the fact that several small, ardently nationalistic,

mutually jealous States have come into existence to replace Austria-Hungary, and that we have thus multiplied the possible centres of disturbance. So far and for the moment, the statement is true. But inasmuch as it ignores two important factors it is a false reading of the situation. These factors are, *first*, the removal of the two worst intriguers in Europe, the Habsburgs and the Romanovs, who must bear (with the Turks) much the heaviest share of the blame for the "Balkanisation" even of the Balkans themselves, and the substitution for them of, *second*, the League of Nations. If the existing Great Powers pass a self-denying ordinance to refrain from selfish intrigue and propaganda, and if the League of Nations sincerely bends its energies to the task of educating the new States as "good Europeans," we shall have no reason to regret our success in bringing new nations to birth. There lies the hope for the future, and the very heart of our hope is the League. "Through Liberation to the New Commonwealth of Central Europe" must be the motto of the League's action; but it could not be the immediate aim of the Peace Conference. And only those who looked for miracles in Paris have any cause to be disappointed with the general result of its work. The settlement proposed will not be permanent, but it offers as good a beginning for the new era as could be expected if all the circumstances be taken into account. Once the League comes into being it will offer periodical opportunities for reviewing the new European situation arising out of the treaty of peace. And we may reasonably hope that the coming generation will see the completion of the process now begun by which, for the first time in European history, a peace based broadly on justice and not on a balance of "interests" has been achieved.

What are the obstacles to be overcome? First, the peacemakers themselves are not yet fully educated in their own principles, and they will probably be unable to see the full bearing of them until Germany has accepted the consequences of her aggression, has admitted and paid (as far as she possibly can) her debt of reparation, and has given practical guarantees that her "change of heart" is a genuine conversion. Second, it would be folly to ignore the plain fact that, despite the Weimar Assembly, the Germans have as yet shown but little understanding of democracy, and that their whole State organisation would still lend itself to militarist ends if a reaction should set in. And there was a distinct fear that if some of the crude proposals relating, for instance, to the Saar Valley, had been sanctioned by the Peace Conference they would have given a rallying cry to German Chauvinists bent on revenge. As things stand the terms of the treaty—especially the demand for reparation—are so stiff that the German Government may resign rather than discuss them. The Allies would then be in a serious dilemma. They have allowed demobilisation to proceed so far that the employment of force to coerce Germany is hardly possible; while on the other hand, to waive their just claim for reparation (excluding, of course, the wild demands of our General Election) would be to put a premium on German methods of warfare. France and Belgium, Poland and Serbia must be restored by those who maimed them, otherwise Germany emerges from the war without defeat.

The third, and perhaps the greatest, obstacle is the acute and world-wide unrest which is the most marked result of the war. It is a mere journalist's *cliché* to call it Bolshevism. The truth is that the mould of civilised society created by the industrial revolution is cracking, and new forms of social organisation are in the making. The danger of the immediate future is that the nations which should form the backbone of the League will be so immersed in the pre-occupation of their own domestic reconstruction that they will have neither the will nor the power to guide the rest of the world as they ought. Much depends upon the wisdom and courage of Governments and of Parliaments in America, France, and Great Britain in the immediate future. A bold social policy at home is the best, if not the only way of meeting the danger. The world cannot afford to see the League of Nations hamstrung by the domestic disorders of its leading members. It is significant of the spirit of the time that one of the most finished parts of the work of the Conference is the Labour Convention. If the working classes see that the League is in earnest in its work for Labour, they will the more readily rally to its support when a crisis arises to test its political power.

Wherever we turn we find that the pivot of international policy in the future is the League of Nations. And my experience in Paris convinces me that the future of the League itself depends upon the relations between, and the spirit which animates, the Big Four who have ruled the Paris Conference. If America, Great Britain, France and Italy stand together for those principles which inspired their peoples—though not always their Governments—throughout the war, the League will be the central force in foreign affairs, and will become more and more, in President Wilson's words, "a vehicle of life" for the nations.

A. F. WHYTE.

THE PROBLEM OF EGYPT.

A REBELLION in Egypt in 1919 has set all men elsewhere asking the question, Why? In 1914 a rebellion was planned for by the German enemy; how thoroughly, the world has not yet been informed. Had it broken out, the causation would have been sufficiently obvious, apart from any known native discontent. But that rebellion should have been averted then and should blaze forth now, when the leagued enemies of the British Empire are prostrate in defeat, signifies a new causation. What is it?

Some have put the hypothesis that Egyptian Moslems are alarmed by the prospect of Jewish domination in Palestine. But even if there were not express testimony that the Zionist leaders have maintained thoroughly friendly relations with those of the Arabs, such an explanation would be plainly inadequate. Moslem feeling in Egypt about Palestine could at most aggravate other grounds of resentment; it could not motive a rebellion in which the Moslems of Palestine have no share. Such a rising, exhibiting no signs of direction from without, must be held to signify grievances within Egypt; and new and special grievances at that. The disorders reported from Cairo on April 14th appear to involve riots directed against the Armenians and Greeks; and it may be that the presence of a number of Armenian refugees has helped to foment fanaticism. But these attacks, as described, have the appearance of being a sequel to the previous insurrection rather than a key to its causation. Normally, the Moslems in Egypt live on perfectly good terms with the numerous Greeks; fanaticism being in fact not a normal factor in the life of the Egyptian mass. And the remarkable statement made by Miss M. E. Durham, in the *Daily News*, of April 2nd would seem to yield the explanation. Thus it runs:—

"I was in Egypt from Nov., 1915, to April, 1916, and can confirm Dr. Haden Guest in his statement that it is to our own treatment of the Egyptians that we owe the present trouble. The authorities were certainly to blame in landing Colonial troops in Egypt without carefully instructing them as to the population they would meet there. So ignorant were numbers of these men that they imagined that Egypt was English, and that the natives of the land were coloured intruders. "Why were these — niggers allowed in here at all."

"More than one Australian said that he would clear the lot out if he had his way. They treated the natives with cruelty and contempt. In the canteen in which I worked a very good native servant was kicked and knocked about simply because he did not understand an order given him by a soldier. An educated native in the town was struck in the mouth, and had his inlaid walking stick forcibly snatched from him by a soldier who wanted it. More than one English resident said to me: "It will take years to undo the harm that has been done here by the army." Personally I felt that were I an Egyptian I should have spared no effort to evict the British. I felt ashamed of my country—bitterly ashamed. The opinion of the native for the soldier was amusingly illustrated by a small conversation book, one phrase of which was to the effect: "You fool. What for you spend all your money on beer?"

And a dialogue with a beggar which ended: "I am poor; I am miserable"; to which the Briton replied: "Go to hell."

"I spoke with great severity frequently to the soldiers, telling them that by their conduct they were proving themselves the enemies of England; that the Germans maltreated the enemy, but that they were attacking their own side and would make enemies. This surprised them very much. They were absolutely ignorant of the situation.

"To make matters worse, for the first few days after the troops arrived in quantities, the drink shops were all open all day, and the unlovely results filled the natives with disgust and contempt. It was reported, I do not know with what truth, that drunken men had snatched the veils from Moslem women. The tale was believed by the natives.

"Small wonder if they hate and dread us."

A correspondent who recently described the parading of crowds of young Egyptians singing appeals to Allah to deliver them from the English, could see nothing but the irony of history in such a spectacle. England was safeguarding Egypt under a more beneficent rule than she had ever known; and here were the protected Egyptians execrating their protectors. Miss Durham's testimony explains what seems so inexplicable; and it is confirmed to me by other observers.

It is probably necessary to impress upon many people in this country that insolent outrage such as that described, inflicted upon people in their own country by a dominant alien race, is about as maddening to the indigenous population as Englishmen found many of the tales of German brutality to British prisoners and subject Belgians during the war. The blood boils in Egypt perhaps more easily than in England. And if any of our people continue to argue, as many of them did a dozen or more years ago, that Egyptians ought to be too thankful for our beneficent rule to feel rebelliously about individual grievances, it will be more necessary than ever to point out that such reasoning tells only of an incurable moral blindness. Old chronicles are full of rebellion arising out of individual outrages; and a nation collectively grateful to an alien race for ruling it is not among the portents of history.

In the days before Italian independence, even Americans were known to deprecate the attitude of Italian patriots towards the paternal Austrian Government that ruled them. It provided bands in the gardens, and did its best in such ways to please its Italian subjects. Probably the Austrian soldiers in those days committed no such outrages as those reported to have been wrought of late in Egypt. Yet the Italians were implacable. They simply could not endure the prospect of being for ever ruled by an alien race. And where race feeling is at work, there is small chance of discrimination between individuals. As some of our noisier patriots would intern and deport all Germans, the more rabid Egyptian patriots hate all Britishers. The officers and soldiers who have recently been murdered may well have been guiltless of any provocation; they would suffer for others' sins. On the other hand, unless someone can prove the large negative that there have been no outrages by soldiers since

Miss Durham's departure in 1916, we are compelled to surmise that some have taken place recently.

It will be remembered that the stern punishment of outrages upon natives in India under Lord Curzon aroused significant anger among our soldiers there. I once met one who, otherwise likely enough to be in political sympathy with that Viceroy, denounced him as the soldiers' enemy on the score of a punishment inflicted on a soldier for shooting a native. Only the strictest supervision could secure the prevention in war time of such acts as Miss Durham describes; and only the proper punishment of military offenders could satisfy Egyptians in general that the British control was determined to enforce strict justice in such matters. But in Egypt, long before the war, the temper of the British residents, both official and non-official, was strongly opposed to any enforcement of equal rights where British and natives came into conflict. The unforgotten story of the Denshaw executions in 1906 is a historic landmark. Educated Egyptians told me in that year that such another episode of wrong would lend overwhelming force to the Nationalist movement, then vigorous under the leadership of an eloquent young editor, whose death soon afterwards notably checked its development. And something doubtless was due to the impartial policy of Sir Eldon Gorst, who was so loudly denounced for taking pains to replace British officials by Egyptians, in opposition to Lord Cromer's policy of making the Civil Service more and more British.

But the Nationalist movement has never died out, and the recent meeting reveals it active in a way that is neither satisfactory nor creditable to the British control. How Government has gone in Egypt during the war it was practically impossible for us at home to know. It was no time for discussing reforms; and military rule had to prevail there at least as much as here. But when the world is intent upon a Peace Settlement which is to remedy as far as may be all the grievances of subjected peoples, it would be idle to suppose that wild mutiny and stern repression (going to the length of bombing open villages) can go on in Egypt without comment or criticism from our Allies, to say nothing of our late enemies. During the war, they found English-writing pens to indict the British control as it had existed under Lord Cromer. In reply, justly enough, stress was laid on the progress which took place in various directions, notably in education, after Lord Cromer's resignation; and it is probable that any impartial foreigner, after careful inquiry, would find the British rule in Egypt compare pretty favourably with that of France in Algeria, or that of any other European power over a "subject" race. But all such defences really miss the mark, however one-sided be the attacks they repel. The whole question of the British control of Egypt must be comprehensively reconsidered, on the lines on which the problem of Indian Government has been reconsidered in the report of Lord Chelmsford and Mr. Montagu. We have to reckon with universal political forces, always operating in some fashion and now revealing themselves on a larger scale than ever before, under the new conditions.

It is to be hoped that we may now be spared the simple-minded arguments which used to meet every suggestion of a need for new

adjustments in India. "The peoples of India," we were regularly told, "cannot govern themselves. If the British Raj were withdrawn——!" To which we reply: Quite so. How then shall we act? The people of Egypt are not yet qualified to manage their own affairs; and to leave Egypt at once to its own devices would be to evoke anarchy, dangerous to the whole Near East. Therefore, that is not what is proposed by British reformers, whatever may be demanded at the moment by Egyptian enthusiasts. But unless British Governments recognise the duty incumbent on Britain of putting Egypt in the way to attain self-government one day, with whatever precautions may be necessary for the internationalisation of the Suez Canal after the establishment of a League of Nations, the British nation will incur an unanswerable charge of disloyalty to all the ideals it professes to pursue in the war settlement.

To repeat the old pleas about the benefits we have conferred upon Egypt would be worse than useless. In Egypt, as elsewhere, there is plenty of poverty, and a far higher rate of mortality from disease than in Britain or in most European countries. It belongs to the nature of things that a people under alien rule will attribute to their rulers whatever special evil befalls them; and a nation which takes the responsibility of governing another must lay its account by such blame. But a very little candid reflection will suggest to any open-minded inquirer that the ruled nation *must* have many grounds for just criticism. Do we not always have them at home, whatever Government may be in power? Is not the party out of power always occupied in pointing out the unfitness of the party in power to govern, and exposing its blunders and iniquities?

The significance of this simple fact is strangely missed by our Imperialists. During the whole period from 1906 to the outbreak of the war they were more or less eloquent in denunciation of the Government in power, on the grounds alike of its principles and its practice, pronouncing its members at once incompetent and unscrupulous; and during the same period they met every criticism of imperial rule over subject peoples with indignant denial of any shortcoming. It is fair, indeed essential, to remember that similar criticism of the preceding Government had been vigorously carried on by Liberals while it was in power. How much of the criticism in either case was valid it is plainly idle to ask. But it would be puerile to affirm on the one hand that as regards either side it was more or less just, and that at the same time British Government in India and Egypt was impeccable. If no Government at home can be trusted to administer rightly save under constant criticism (and this was the one doctrine on which the two parties coincided before Mr. George made his famous announcement that *his* Government did not "want any criticism"), it needs no proving that an alien Government, ruling a race widely differing from it in every way, must be open to just criticism in a much higher degree. One might suppose that such a conclusion could pass as a truism; but for most people it has apparently not yet reached the status of a probable truth. The question is simply not considered. Yet if Egypt were under any rule but British, British critics in general would hold it a matter of course that such a mutiny as has recently been quelled

there must signify some kind of misgovernment. The fact that we *can* quell a mutiny by bombing, from aeroplanes, the open villages of a population which simply cannot organise a military resistance, is no proof whatever either of the general badness of the Egyptian cause or the goodness of ours.

Recollections of the history of Poland might suffice to move thinking men in this country to seek for a policy which shall not merely "hold down" the Egyptian people now but make it unnecessary to hold them down in future. Whatever the patriots in Parliament and the Northcliffe Press may say for the moment, this bombing of open villages and flogging of rioters cannot improve our reputation either in Christendom or in the Moslem world; and it will not be permanently possible even for the patriots to keep up a denunciation of Germans for their past bombing of non-combatants here while we bomb non-combatants in Egypt. And there is a painful probability that such episodes will recur unless we make a new departure in Egyptian Government.

It is presumably well known that the present system is one embodying a few of the forms without any of the realities of self-government. At every stage at which those forms have been adjusted, the obvious purpose was to give nothing approaching real power of any kind either to the mass of the people or to Egyptian Ministers who nominally administered. For such a policy of emasculation the private defence has always been that neither Ministers nor people can be trusted, the former to govern or the latter to control them. It may simplify the discussion to admit that for this plea there is some justification. It would be hard to prove that the majority of the electors in Britain who polled at the last General Election are well qualified to vote. They are now showing signs of a change of feeling which could hardly be paralleled in Oriental history for quickness and completeness. That being so, it is not to be supposed that the people of Egypt are properly fitted to exercise political power. But that does not alter the fact that in Egypt as in Europe the only way in which any population can become fitted to exercise political power is to begin using some degree of political choice.

Certainly it is important that some amount of education, in the ordinary sense of the term, should precede political enfranchisement—though a franchise long subsisted with a low standard of popular education in our own country. But Englishmen cannot long plead lack of education in Egypt as a ground for denying it any measure of real self-government, when it is by the decision of the British control that Egypt remains so largely uneducated. The policy of Lord Cromer in that regard was fatally transparent. Until within a short time of his resignation he refused even the appeal of his British (the controlling) Minister of Education to spend more than £200,000 a year on the schooling of a nation numbering some twelve millions. The finances of Egypt, he declared, did not admit of an expenditure much in excess of that. When criticism was brought to bear in the British Parliament, he quickly discovered that he could spend the £400,000 his Minister had asked for; and since his day the expenditure has greatly increased, still without giving Egypt a good system of schools.

The reforms, such as they are, have been largely the result of native pressure. Egyptians of all classes have long agitated for better and better schools, and in particular for a good modern University. Before the advent of the British control Egypt was, to a very considerable extent, in a state of educational progress. A study of the catalogue of the Khedivial Library in 1906 revealed that quite a large number of scientific and other works had been translated into Arabic, chiefly from the French, in the days of Ismail and his predecessors. Yet when it was urged upon Lord Cromer's Government that science teaching should be introduced into the programme of the secondary schools, the official answer was that books for the purpose did not exist. As they had existed a generation before, the irresistible conclusion was that the British control had let Egypt retrograde from the level reached under Moslem rule. So reactionary was the influence of the Cromer tradition that only after much pressure was it made possible for students of agriculture in Egypt to secure instruction in their own language. The Cromer tradition was that they must master either French or English for the purpose. Let the reader try to imagine what would be said of a British Government that refused to give instruction in scientific agriculture to farmers' sons save in a foreign language.

It is perfectly true that Lord Cromer managed Egyptian finances well and economically, in contrast with the extremely bad management of the old régime. Probably no native Government could have approached to the efficiency, to say nothing of the rectitude, of the British control in finance. As to all that there is no dispute. But it savours almost of burlesque to argue that the duty of the British control towards Egypt was fulfilled when Egypt was made to pay full interest on all its debts and meet the whole costs, civil and military, of the British administration. For generations past, it has been an axiom in our politics that it is the business of governments to look to the moral welfare of the nation as well as to its finance, and it is upon their contributions to that welfare that political parties now mainly found their claims to support. The very backwardness of Egypt was a ground for special measures to promote her moral progress. To make the defence of British rule consist in having regulated her finances and increased her productivity while leaving her more backward than ever in the elements of qualification for self-government, was to discredit the cause that was defended. The obvious answer of every impartial foreigner to such a plea would be: "You claim credit and gratitude for having secured the safe payment of your own bondholders, in whose interest you originally entered Egypt. Orderly government was essential to that. To earn credit and gratitude you must do a good deal more. You must raise the levels of life for the people of Egypt as you confessedly seek to raise them for your people at home. And you must know—what nation can know better?—that a people declared unfit to manage their own affairs are thereby pronounced low in the human scale."

It is doubtless true that no other European nation would have done better in the circumstances. Neither France nor Germany, neither Belgium nor Italy, would conceivably have administered Egypt in the same period either more sympathetically or more

progressively than we have done; and it is doubtful whether any of them would have reached a greater productivity, though all the great engineering schemes seem to have been originally planned by Frenchmen. But this is a mere reiteration of the economic plea, with its implied denial of any such duty towards a subject race as all civilised Governments avow towards their own peoples.

It is, to say the least, unfortunate for the British Government that such an outbreak in Egypt should follow immediately on the close of the world war, when "self-determination for subject races" passes for a principle with the Peace Conference. Had those responsible for the control of Egypt in the past sought to fulfil our old pledges with more of goodwill and good faith, we might have escaped this unpleasant emergency; though it will doubtless be argued that Lord Morley's progressive measures in India did not avert sedition there in 1914, and later. But the conclusion come to by responsible inquirers as regards India is obviously still more compulsive as regards Egypt. Our duty to prepare that country for self-government has been again and again officially avowed, from the time of our first entrance; and those who think we can for ever go on simply repressing discontent and maintaining the *status quo*, are plainly unteachable by events. If the British control does not get newly into touch with intelligent native opinion, the situation will infallibly go from bad to worse, and this in the eyes of a world newly critical of "imperialism." That long vaunted ideal has somewhat rapidly become a term of censure for whole nations.

We shall be faced, as a matter of course, with the regulation formula that there can be no talk of concessions to a people who have been recently in rebellion. The Russian bureaucracy used to talk in that fashion and we have seen the outcome. If those responsible for British rule in Egypt have in any degree learned the lesson, they will as soon as possible set about securing native support by taking natives into council; by giving room for real initiative to the nominal Egyptian Ministers, who must know a good deal more about Egypt than do more than a few of the British bureaucracy there, civil or military; and by giving some reality to the forms of self-government which thus far have been allowed to count for next to nothing in Egyptian politics. Before the war, there were chronic and bitter complaints about the disregard of native wishes, as expressed by the elected representatives, in regard to matters of administration nearly concerning Egyptian welfare. During the war, there as here, there must have been the possible minimum of consultation of the people. Perhaps what has happened in the English by-elections within the last month or two may suffice to suggest to the British Government that the sooner it resumes touch with public opinion everywhere the better it will be for national stability, to say nothing of the stability of the Ministry. Egyptian mutiny is only the non-constitutional version of the dissatisfaction that expresses itself in elections in the constitutional country. And, to put the case at its lowest, the safe course is to set about making Egypt constitutional.

J. M. ROBERTSON.

NORTHERN EPIRUS: AN IMPORTUNATE QUESTION.

THERE are so many interesting new questions just now that people have got no time to spare for the old ones, which are dull because they are old. But many of the dull old questions still are unsettled, and ready to come and put themselves to us in the most embarrassing way if they consider themselves neglected for younger and fresher rivals. The question of Northern Epirus is one of them. It is an old question enough, but not really dull. Age cannot wither it, nor custom stale. Until it succeeds in getting itself answered it will go on putting itself to Europe in its youthful way about once a year, in the shape of a local war or a revolution. It would probably save time and trouble in the long run if the Conference could spare a minute to provide it at last with the answer for which it has so long been asking. It must, of course, be the right answer. Often and often have the bothered Powers tried to pacify the importunate question with the wrong answer, and the question has always refused to be pacified, and organised another "outbreak."

What is the question? It is the question of the political destiny of a strip of mountain, vale, and hill about forty miles wide, that forms the northern part of the province of Epirus opposite Corfu. There are two important towns in it, Argyrocastro and Choritsa, and a port, Santa Quaranta, and it has a population, mostly village-dwelling, of about 230,000. Turkey had it before the first Balkan war, and now Greece and Albania both claim it, and that is the question. It is not really dull, because 230,000 hardy warfaring peasants are not likely to allow a question to be dull which, they believe, deeply affects their spiritual and material welfare.

In an interesting article about "Albania at the Peace Conference," in the April number of this Review, Mr. H. Charles Woods gives the question a simple and a summary answer. "Greece," he writes, "animated largely by nationalistic motives, but also partly by a desire to secure the port of Santa Quaranta and its hinterland, . . . is endeavouring to extend her north-western frontier at the expense of Albania." There, certainly, is the matter in a nutshell. At least, there certainly is a nutshell, and there is something inside it, but there may be a doubt remaining whether what is inside it is the matter in question. Are we not all vociferously agreed nowadays that the political destiny of a country should be decided, not by the wishes of neighbouring States, but by those of its inhabitants? Shall we not be more up to date, then, if we say that the answer to the question of Northern Epirus is not to be found by reference to the ambitions, legitimate or illegitimate, of Greece or of Albania, but by reference to one thing only, the wishes of the Northern Epirotes? If we do say so, we shall not be able to find so simple or so summary an answer as that of Mr. Woods, because the population of Northern Epirus is a mixed and not a simple population; but we may have a better chance of finding the right answer.

What are the wishes of the Northern Epirotes? They have never been expressed directly by a *plébiscite*, and perhaps they never can be. To get a fair *plébiscite* there it would be necessary to shut every inhabitant up in a separate room under an adequate armed guard while he cast his vote. Evidence about their wishes must be sought indirectly, in their racial, linguistic, and religious characteristics, and in their recent history.

The inhabitants are divided into two camps, the Mohammedan Albanian Epirotes and the Orthodox Greek Epirotes. Between the two, competent observers are, I think, agreed that there is no clear distinction of race. Amongst the Mohammedans there may be more (Albanian) Tose blood, amongst the Christians more pure blood of the indigenous Epirote race, which, it may be said, it is now very difficult to distinguish from the Greek race. But on the whole the inhabitants are all much alike physically, and their divisions are not due to differences of descent. Language affords no clearer dividing line. The Christians all speak Greek, and nearly all the Mohammedans speak Albanian; but most of the Christians speak Albanian too, and many of the Mohammedans speak Greek. Wherever the two camps come into close contact, the population is, in fact, bilingual; and an observer of Albanian sympathies who relied solely on language as a guide might pass through the countryside and find nothing but Albanians, where an observer of Greek sympathies, proceeding in the same manner, might find nothing but Greeks. It is not race or language that separates the camps, but religion. The most important figures then are these, that of the 230,000 inhabitants, 120,000 are Orthodox and 110,000 are Mohammedans.

The preponderance of the Orthodox is not very great in numbers but it is very great indeed in other and even more important matters, in culture and civilisation, in energy, in progressiveness, and in a conscious spirit of unity and nationality. Whenever the country has been left free for a time to follow its own devices, this moral preponderance of the Orthodox element has always asserted itself in an immediate and determined movement towards union with Greece.

Nothing has so much confounded counsel on the Balkan scene as the digging up of ancient and irrelevant history. Pyrrhus, Basil Bulgaroktonos, and Skanderbeg were interesting people, but their interest is for the historian, and not for the peasant who drives his plough to-day under the hillside of Argyrocastro. On the other hand, in our search for a guide as to that peasant's political sympathies, we cannot do better than consult the record of his political actions in the immediate past. They are not at all irrelevant, because they are the only means that he has had of making his opinion known. The story of his recent doings is familiar. When the Powers made an Albanian State in 1913, after the second Balkan war, they sent a Commission to fix its southern frontier. The Commission decided to take language as a guide—in a bilingual country! It would have been hardly less sensible to have said that they would divide the inhabitants into those who had a left leg and those who had a right leg. By firmly closing their eyes to all

right legs, in other words, by ignoring the Greek speech of all bilinguals, the Commission succeeded in arriving at the conclusion that the country should belong to Albania. The Greek troops thereupon withdrew, and the inhabitants immediately rose, and declared Northern Epirus an autonomous State in sympathy with Greece. After some months of fighting with the Albanian forces, they received in 1914 from a Congress at Corfu full recognition of their national autonomy, in formal allegiance to Albania. When the great war began, and Albania resumed its accustomed anarchy, Northern Epirus obtained the full achievement of its desires in the form of a mandate for its occupation and administration by the Greek Government. An unfettered election was held, and representatives were returned to the Greek Parliament. But this bright chapter was soon to close. *Real politik* brought in the Italians for a military occupation, and the people were subjected to a new foreign domination. On this last and still unfinished chapter of their history, however, we need not dwell. In view of Articles 6 and 7 of the secret Treaty of London,* nobody, I imagine, is prepared to contend that Italy has any permanent business south of Valona. What business she has at Valona, indeed, is a thing that we have never had explained to us, according at least to the new gospel of self-determination. But perhaps it is hardly a question for us to ask. Italy can give such a baffling answer by a silent glance westward to the Straits.

On the only recent occasion, then, on which Northern Epirus has been left free to follow its own devices, it has immediately and with a spontaneous and irresistible motion swung right over towards Greece. The autonomous Government of 1913-14, which gave the impulse for the swing, was democratic, efficient, well organised, and progressive. It was created and controlled by native Epirote patriots under the leadership of M. Christaki Zographos, himself of Droviani. Its volunteer army was well disciplined and led, and had little difficulty in repelling the attacks of the Albanian bands from the north. During a visit to the country in June, 1914, I saw well-managed hospitals and refugee camps, communications and transport well maintained, and I received a strong impression of a people rejoicing in new-found liberty, and in the dawning hope of advance in civilisation and prosperity, given to them after so many centuries of stagnation and oppression by the military *cordon* which was protecting them from their age-long enemies in wild Albania. Safe at last from the north, all eyes were turned south towards Greece in hope and confidence. There can be no doubt that

* ARTICLE 6.—Italy will receive in absolute proprietorship Valona, the Island of Saseno, and sufficient territory to ensure the military safety of the possession thereof. It is proposed, for instance, that this territory shall be that extending as far as the river Vojuzá to the north and east, and to the frontier of the Chimarra district to the south.

ARTICLE 7.—After having received Trentino and Istria, under Article 4, Dalmatia and the Adriatic islands under Article 5 and the Bay of Valona under Article 6, Italy will offer no opposition, in the event of the formation of a small neutral State in Albania, to the possible wish of France, Great Britain and Russia to divide between Montenegro, Serbia and Greece the frontier districts in the north and south of Albania. The southern coast of Albania, from the frontier of the Italian territory of Valona to Cape Stylos, will be neutralised.

they are doing so still, behind the veil which the Italian occupation has drawn over the country. If we are to consider only the wishes of the people, it is very clear from their recent history that we must be prepared to give their question a Greek answer. Language, race, faith, culture, and tradition all draw them more strongly in that direction than in any other. Practical considerations draw them thither far more strongly still. From the point of view of material advantages, which State would it be better for them to join: civilised and orderly Greece, a land of settled government, or uncivilised and disorderly Albania, an embryo in the family of nations, whose separate existence, even, is still for the future to decide? The Northern Epirotes have made up their minds very definitely about their answer to that question. "We will not be shut up in a house with savages!" they used to say.

The question of Northern Epirus has been left so long unsettled that it has grown up and had a family of little questions. The eldest of them is the question of Chimarra, a true chip of the old block. The village and district of that name lie on the south-western slope of the Chika (Akrokeraunian) mountains, the range which runs S.E. and N.W., to the south of Valona, and sticks out into the Adriatic as the promontory of Glossa. There are about eighteen small villages or settlements in the district, and 10,000 inhabitants. Protected by the mountains on one side and by the sea upon the other, the Chimarriotes succeeded all through the long centuries of the Turkish night in maintaining special privileges, which amounted to partial independence. They were governed by their own chief, the Archigos; they were exempt from taxation and military service; and an annual tribute was their only concession to the nominal sovereignty of the Sultan. The Chimarriotes were the Suliotes of the North, less fortunate, but more splendid, in their greater isolation and obscurity. No Byron ever came to celebrate their long and glorious struggle for freedom. The secret of their indomitable courage and pertinacity was, and still is, a burning spirit of loyalty to their Greek nationality. Perhaps they are the descendants of some countrymen and contemporaries of Ulysses that came to these sea-board villages in ships, and drove the Albanian natives back across the mountain passes above. Knowing how ardently they love Greece and Greek culture, and with what faithful devotion, century after century, as long as history can remember, they have longed for union with Greece, one cannot but believe that the blood running in their veins is Greek blood of some pure and ancient strain. When the opportunity of Northern Epirus came in 1913, they were the first to seize it. Led by their Archigos, an office now hereditary in the house of Spiromilios, they rose, proclaimed the autonomy of Chimarra in alliance with M. Zographos' Government at Argyrocastro, and fortified their passes against their hereditary enemies, the Albanians. During the struggle that followed they, in their mountains, were the pivot on which the left wing of the Epirote line rested. Their privileges were confirmed by the pact of Corfu, and they shared with their Epirote fellow-countrymen the joys and sorrows of the subsequent occupations by the forces of Greece and

Italy. Like their fellow-countrymen, they have now disappeared behind the Italian veil. Many of the kindly and spirited men with whom I sat in 1914 under their fig trees on the mountainside are now exiles on the barren Italian island of Favignana. Some have died there. It is all rather hard to understand, when their one desire was to settle down in peace and quiet under Greece.

“ But things like this you know must be
After a famous victory.”

One thing, however, is easy to understand, for anybody who knows the Chimarriotes, who has watched with them on their passes, and listened over the camp fire to tales of old Albanian wars, who has been to their schools and heard the children singing their Greek songs with a note of passionate longing in their voices that would have moved a stone—that it would be utterly iniquitous, and not less iniquitous than foolish, to crush the national aspirations of the Chimarriotes, and to force them under the rule of a people that they loathe and despise.

Another little question, the offspring of the question of Northern Epirus, is the question of Choritsa, in the north-east. The population of 70,000 in the city and district of that name is about equally divided between Orthodox and Mohammedans. The Albanian language is spoken generally, but there is a strong Hellenic spirit, especially in the city. Bangas, one of the most munificent benefactors of the Hellenic revival, came from Choritsa; and the citizens support at ordinary times forty-four Greek schools, with about 3,500 scholars. During the war the district has been occupied by French forces from Monastir. When Greece was in disgrace because of the performances of the traitor Constantine, our French Allies, with that *naïveté* which they sometimes display in their dealings with alien peoples, established a “ Republic of Choritsa ” under Albanian leaders antagonistic to the Greeks. The result was unfortunate. The Albanian leaders were found to be Austrian spies, and were shot.

On the principles of self-determination, Choritsa is a hard marginal case. With the population so evenly divided between Orthodox and Mohammedans, it would be difficult to arrive at a just decision by counting heads. If, however, we are to consider not only the number of heads but what is inside them, the case for union with Greece becomes clearer. Here, as elsewhere in Northern Epirus, the progressive and civilising elements are those that desire a Greek future, and there can be little doubt that the town will be better off as part of an ordered and established State than as part of one that is likely for many years to come to be unsettled and turbulent.

There is, however, another consideration affecting Choritsa which—although we may admit that it has no relation to the principles of self-determination—is nevertheless of too much practical importance to Epirus as a whole to be entirely disregarded by even the most uncompromising follower of President Wilson. The Pindus range cuts Southern (Greek) Epirus completely off from Southern (Greek) Macedonia. It is not until one has travelled as far north as

Choritsa that one finds a way through by the passes of the Devoli. To include Choritsa in Albania would be to cut off North-Eastern Greece from all direct communication with North-Western Greece. A traveller from Janina to Florina, for instance, would then have to go round by sea, unless he were prepared to ride over the passes of Metsovo, and I can answer for it that that is not a route that anyone would care to follow if he could go any other way. There is no road, the wolves are unfriendly, and the hotels are not good. Inhabitants of a level land like ours can hardly realise how vitally such a matter as this may affect the inhabitants of a mountainous land. For them, access to a pass may make all the difference between economic progress and decay. The consideration must be faced that to cut Greece off from the Choritsa gap is to inflict a grave material injury upon the whole of her northern territories. That should not, no doubt, be allowed to weigh in the balance were the national sympathies of Choritsa quite clear. But since consideration of her sympathies leaves the balance trembling, perhaps the practical consideration may not unreasonably be thrown in to tip the scale.

To give the Greek answer to the question of Northern Epirus does not imply any hostility on the part of the giver towards the Albanians. On the contrary, it would surely be far better for Albania as well as for everybody else that Northern Epirus should be left outside her future borders. She has troubles enough before her, and the worst of her troubles will be her lack of homogeneity. The future has yet to show what form of government can be devised to keep the internal peace between the mountain clans, between Catholic and Mohammedan Ghegs, and Mohammedan and Orthodox Toscs, and the external peace between Albanians, Serbs, and Greeks. Whatever the Government may be, it will have no bed of roses. Surely they are not very prudent friends of Albania who would have her add to her many troubles an alien population of at least 120,000 souls, all inspired with an ardent nationalism that for centuries has been in direct and bitter opposition to her own, all seeking the first opportunity of breaking free from her, and bent on giving her all the trouble that they can in the meanwhile. The equilibrium would be hopelessly unstable. There are in any case 45,000 Greeks in admittedly Albanian districts north of Northern Epirus, and that should be enough for Albania to go on with. She will have enough ready-made domestic troubles without adding to them the troubles incidental to an imperialist policy.

The Northern Epirotes, it would seem, have given a very clear Greek answer to their question in the revolution of 1914; and it is the answer that one would expect from their interests, characteristics and traditions. An Albanian answer would do Albania no good and Greece much harm. There seems in this matter to be a fortunate agreement between concrete practical interests and abstract national ideals. Might not the Conference, then, pluck up heart and set the uneasy question of Northern Epirus at rest with the answer that it has so long desired?

E. HILTON YOUNG.

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR LEGISLATION.

THE draft Convention on International Labour Legislation marks a stage in the development of civilised life. It is not revolutionary. It contains very much less than is required for the removal of those evils of the industrial system which are fostered by the world-system of commerce, finance, and manufacture. The lofty sentiments in its preamble may be contrasted with the meagre provisions of its agreed articles. But it is undeniably significant of coming changes: and that such a Convention should be agreed on by the great industrial States implies that a new world may arise out of the confusion left by the war; for, whatever its limitations, the Convention is an admirable piece of work, deserving the hearty support of all who desire to leave the world better than they found it.

The preamble recognises the evils of the industrial system: "conditions of labour exist," it is said, "involving such injustice, hardship, and privation to large numbers of people as to produce unrest so great that the peace and harmony of the world are imperilled;" and therefore "the high contracting parties moved by sentiments of justice and humanity as well as by the desire to secure the permanent peace of the world agree to the following Convention." The suffering of those whom President Wilson has called "the silent masses" of men is one ground for action; and we may be allowed to hope that the sentiments of justice for these would have moved the high contracting parties without the additional danger of "unrest." But obviously the danger of revolution is another and an adequate ground for action. The preamble further recites the methods by which "an improvement" of the conditions of labour may be secured—"the regulation of the hours of work, including the establishment of a maximum working day and week, the regulation of the labour supply, the prevention of unemployment, the provision of an adequate living wage, the protection of the worker against sickness, disease, and injury arising out of his employment, the protection of children, young persons, and women, provision for old age and disablement, protection of the interests of workers when employed in countries other than their own, recognition of the freedom of association, the organisation of technical and vocational education, and other measures."

For these general purposes the Convention creates (i) a General Conference to meet at least once a year, and (ii) an International Labour Office, controlled by a Governing Body of twenty-four members. The Convention is confined to the establishment of this organisation, and does not include any measures of labour legislation. The first chapter of the Convention (Articles 1 to 13) describes the nature of the organisation; the second chapter (Articles 14 to 34) describes the procedure and functions of the organisation; the third chapter (Articles 35 to 38) contains provisions and provision for amendments or interpretation; and the fourth chapter (Articles 39 to 41) contains transitory arrangements for the

immediate future. The organisation is apparently intended to provide for a full discussion of labour problems affecting the international situation and for a speedy preparation of conventions which may be made the basis for legislation in the States concerned.

The General Conference will consist of *four* representatives from each of the States signing the Convention, of whom *two* will be Government delegates, *one* will represent the employers, and *one* the workpeople. Advisers may accompany the delegates, and when the questions specially affect women "one at least of the advisers should be a woman." Agenda put before the Conference will form the subject of proposals for either (a) a recommendation as to legislation by the States concerned, or (b) an international convention. It is laid down that any recommendation or convention agreed to by a two-thirds majority of the Conference may be laid before the competent authorities in the several States. Further arrangements are made in the terms of the Convention with regard to the procedure in the General Conference. This Conference, therefore, will be a fairly large body of whom one half will be "official" members representing Governments; and it will be the source of labour legislation affecting international interests. The meetings of the Conference are designed to be at least annual, and presumably there will be some permanence in the membership; so that there may be continuous and, it is to be hoped, public discussion of the problems of labour in the several States of the world. The voting in the Conference will not be in national groups, since every delegate will be "entitled to vote individually." (Article 4.) But clearly the Conference is not a Parliament, since it cannot legislate or control the executive power which remains with the several States.

The normal day-to-day work on international labour legislation will be undertaken by the International Labour Office, which is dependent upon the General Conference in so far as the twelve non-governmental members of its Governing Body are to be *elected* by the delegates of the General Conference not representing the Governments (Protocol to Article 7). The Governing Body, therefore, consists of (i) twelve persons nominated by twelve Governments, of which eight are Governments of States "which are of the chief industrial importance," and four are selected by the Government delegates from among the other States represented at the General Conference; and of (ii) twelve elected members, six elected by the delegates of the General Conference representing the employers and six elected by the delegates representing the workpeople. There is no express provision as to the number of meetings of the Governing Body or as to its method of controlling and directing the work of the permanent staff of the Labour Office; but it is agreed (Article 22) that each State shall send an annual report to the Labour Office containing such particulars as the Governing Body may require. The Governing Body may also receive representations from non-official bodies and may put before the State concerned any complaint so made; or it may appoint a Commission of Enquiry. The constitution of such a Commission is laid down (Article 26): it is to consist of one representative of

employers, one representative of workpeople, and one person of independent standing. It is further agreed that the States shall put at the disposal of this Commission of Enquiry all relevant information.

We may now turn to the consideration of the permanent Secretariat, which is evidently conceived as part of the general secretariat of the League of Nations, although provision is made for the establishment of the Labour organisation before the League of Nations is in existence. The Labour Office, under a Director appointed by the Governing Body, is to collect and distribute "information on all subjects relating to the international adjustment of conditions of industrial life and labour, and particularly the examination of subjects which it is proposed to bring before the Conference with a view to the conclusion of international conventions" (Article 10). It will edit a paper in French and English; and other functions may be "assigned to it by the General Conference." The Director is to be in the closest touch with the Government departments of the several States which are parties to the Convention; and he will be responsible to the Secretary General of the League of Nations for all expenditure. The additional details with regard to the International Labour Office follow naturally from these general rules as to its duties; and it is obvious that it is conceived upon the lines of the non-official Basle Bureau.

One further point of special interest in the Convention is the provision made for the British Dominions and India, with which may be connected the provision in regard to a federal State. It is laid down (Article 35) that the British Dominions and India shall have the same rights and obligations as if they were separate contracting States; and the same is to be true of any self-governing dependency. This will imply representation and a share of control. Further, it is agreed (Article 19) that a Federal Government is to treat an agreed convention as a recommendation to be passed on to the component States, in cases in which they have sole power in regard to labour legislation. This will be of great importance with regard to the United States of America, for it implies that the Federal Government cannot secure the adhesion of the States of the Union to an international labour Convention; and it may very well be that some of the States of the Union will refuse to pass legislation otherwise agreed upon. But this is a case in which the different constitutional character of the different States now existing makes international organisation more complex; and perhaps a method will be found for making the organisation adequate in spite of the limited power of some Federal Governments.

It is contemplated that in some cases there may be need to enforce a decision of the Conference against a recalcitrant or dilatory Government; and although no action is suggested before the Commission of Enquiry has reported, it is laid down as a final measure that if any State fails to carry out the recommendations of that report "any other State may take against that State the measures of an economic character indicated in the report of the Commission or in the decision of the Court as appropriate to the case" (Article 33). Thus, after a full process of enquiry and

adjudication, the actual "sanction" is left in the hands of the separate States. This may be the only practicable plan which could be agreed upon at present. It may prove effective. It does not, indeed, indicate any great advance on our present methods, since it is quite possible even now for one State to take economic action against another on grounds which may be those affecting labour legislation. But presumably we should read between the lines of the Convention in this matter; for it is more than possible that an International Committee which issued a clear report would create a public opinion everywhere, and that this would be in fact the "sanction" required.

The text of the draft Convention or a full paraphrase will now be in the hands of the public; and therefore no further exposition is needed here.* The Commission, appointed on January 31st, 1919, has produced a definite plan of action, although its work was clearly very difficult and many different opinions and interests had to be reconciled. In presenting the draft Convention to the Peace Conference on April 11th, Mr. Barnes emphasised the purpose for which the Commission worked. He developed the ideas embodied in the preamble by calling attention to the distress which accompanies the industrial system; and clearly all international action should aim at the removal of that distress, although the present Convention only provides machinery and not actual reform. The draft, in spite of certain weaknesses and compromises, provides a good basis for the final Convention which will probably be the result of amendments and additions to the present document; but the public at large should make it clear by all the means in their power that they require and expect some such Convention to be signed as soon as possible. It is proposed in the terms of the present Convention (Article 39 and Schedule) that a Conference on the whole subject should be held in the near future at Washington and much will depend upon the effectiveness of that Conference.

When the final Convention is signed, unless it is very different from the present draft, we shall have an international organisation for dealing with relevant labour problems. Obviously we shall not have begun to deal with the problems themselves; but it is an advance to have our machinery prepared. For some time efforts have been made by private persons to organise the methods of joint regulation in regard to labour in the various industrial States; and it is well known that the International Association for Labour Legislation, formed in 1890, initiated through its Bureau at Basle some important official conferences. The activities of the Basle Bureau resulted in 1906 in (1) a Convention prohibiting night-work for women, agreed to by thirteen States, and (2) a Convention prohibiting the use of white phosphorus in the manufacture of matches.

In the last year of the war the Basle Bureau issued a memorandum suggesting action which should be taken at the Peace Conference.† The memorandum recited the various measures of international labour legislation which were then regarded as possible subjects for immediate agreement; and these included the establishment of

* A full summary will be found in the *Times* of March 11th.

† Published in *Soziale Praxis* for August 8th, 1918.

a minimum age (14 years) for the employment of juveniles, the eight-hours' shift, the weekly holiday, prohibition of the use of poisonous substances in industry, accident insurance for international transport, social insurance, minimum rates, and colonial labour contracts. Finally, the Bureau suggested an international agreement "by means of which the reports of the superintendent officials of labour protection would be co-ordinated and the international Union for the Legal Protection of Labour would receive recognition." This implied the creation of an official international organisation for the development of labour legislation in all countries. And now we shall have this organisation. The problems, however, remain unsolved; and they become more important and more complex with every change in the industrial and commercial activities of the world. They, and not the official organisation, should attract the chief attention; or rather, in establishing an International Labour Office, we should keep our eyes upon the purposes for which any such organisation may be used. The General Conference and the Labour Office as suggested in the draft Convention must be considered in view of the problems which have to be solved; for government offices have in the past been known to be sometimes somewhat inactive; and if a new office is to acquire the inertia of the connected departments in the several States, we shall be asked to believe that the problems have been solved when we have only prepared the apparatus for solving them.

The problems are such as the following.

1. *Export Trade*.—Differences in wages rates in two exporting countries may so affect one of the two that in open competition it is driven out of a particular trade. Thus, "fabric" gloves are made in Japan by girls who are paid about three shillings a week; and the gloves are exported to England and other countries. But in England the wages paid to women in the "fabric" glove trade are about thirty shillings; and therefore the price of the English gloves is generally higher both here and in the countries to which we export them. Again, the age of workers differs in different countries; for example, children work in the cotton mills in India at the age of nine, while we, under our new Education Act, are attempting to raise the school age to fourteen without exceptions. Further, the conditions affecting workers in some countries may be so regulated by law as to raise the cost of production for exporters from these countries. It is continually urged, whether validly or not we need not here decide, that factory legislation militates against our power to compete in the world market, and even labour representatives appear to accept this statement as true; and true or not, the fact that the statement is believed obstructs reform. For these reasons presumably the Committee on Industrial and Commercial Policy after the War concluded that "the producers of this country are entitled to require from the Government that they should be protected in their home market . . . against the introduction of "sweated" goods, by which term we understand goods produced by labour which is not paid at Trade Union rates of wages, where such rates exist in the country of origin of the goods, or the current rates of that country where there are no Trade Union rates."*

* Cd. 9035, 1918, para. 352.

2. *General Conditions in Industry.*—Apart from rivalries in the export trade, the whole situation in an industrial country may affect the situation in other like countries. If *all* the manufactures of a country are produced by underpaid and enslaved labour, that country may be able to oust from its markets the products of free labour. There are already great differences between the conditions, apart from natural advantages, in different countries; but the problem is likely to be more acute if the labour of African negroes, for example, is used industrially. Clearly manufacturers are prepared to move their works not only from district to district, but from country to country, in order to obtain cheaper, more docile, and more abundant labour. It may also be possible in the near future for manufacturers to move bodies of docile workers from country to country. Therefore it is no longer possible to regard industrial conditions as a merely domestic problem.

These are the facts; but what precisely is the problem in the international sphere? Some appear to suppose that the States ought to prohibit "unfair" competition; and, indeed, that would be a subject for Utopian legislation. What is "unfair"? Presumably the same authority can decide, who will tell us what is a "reasonable" profit and what is a "living" wage. But the State, according to others, does not exist for the purpose of assisting traders to "capture markets"; it exists—all States exist—for the organisation of public services and the regulation and direction of those private enterprises which provide supplies and services. The problem in the international sphere is the joint action of States for the promotion of better conditions and freer lives for men, women, and children. And so long as the problem is regarded as essentially a rivalry between the trading interests of the citizens of each State, there can be no solution. We should not look for a method of dodging or obstructing or anticipating the foreigner; that may be the purpose of commerce, but it cannot be the purpose of government. We should devise a method by which the Governments of all industrial States may assist by joint action in the promotion of that kind of life for which every Government is supposed to exist; and such joint action can only be taken if the organisation proposed under the draft Convention is regarded as a first step towards abolishing the primitive isolation of sovereign States in their labour policy, their industrial legislation, and their administration.

3. *Emigration.*—The movement of workers across frontiers produces problems affecting the interests of the emigrants and problems affecting other workers in the country to which the emigrants go. There are also problems of sanitation and infectious diseases which affect the public at large. In the first place, emigrants are now largely in the hands of booking agents and brokers. As many as 291,040 emigrants left Russia for the United States in 1913; and in the same year 309,950 went from Austria-Hungary. Most of these went from one misery to another, blindly, and guided only by men who are not necessarily evil-minded, but are moved chiefly by men who are not necessarily evil-minded, but are moved chiefly by the desire for private gain. The conditions on emigrant-ships are

partly controlled; but large profits are earned by the shipping companies from the monies paid by the emigrants or their friends. The conditions of entry are usually regulated, but there is insufficient information among intending emigrants, and there are no international rules. The vast majority of the emigrants of the world are moving into distant and permanent homes; but there is also a large movement between contiguous countries in Europe of "seasonal" workers or workers who reside abroad only for a time. For example, in France in 1911, there were Italians of the working classes numbering 151,421 men and 52,792 women.

What is needed in this regard is some international arrangement of social insurance. The worker should not lose the benefit of any system in his native land to which he has contributed, and, on the other hand, he should enter into the benefits provided by the State under whose jurisdiction he has come to work, upon agreed terms. In all matters affecting legislation it is essential that the point of view of the workers should take precedence of that of the employers; since in no case should it be possible to treat men and women as exportable surplus or imported "man-power." The workers in the country receiving immigrants should be able to secure that their organisation is not weakened by the use of foreign labour.

The whole subject of emigration, therefore, is one of immense importance for any international labour organisation which may be formed. It is also a problem of urgency, since the flow of emigration will begin as soon as there are transport facilities; and the result of war-diseases, of semi-starvation and social revolution may affect the whole world through emigration. The situation will be abnormal. We should be prepared to deal with it.

In view of such problems as these it may be asked what the apparatus suggested under the draft Convention would be likely to accomplish. Clearly it would accelerate the preliminary negotiations between the States in regard to labour legislation. It would provide for publicity, discussion, and definite statements as to the interests involved. In the case of hesitation on the part of any State, when agreement had been reached by other States, it would provide a means of exerting pressure. In all these ways it would be an immense advance.

On the other hand, at its best it provides only a first step in the right direction, and forces are moving in the world at present which will either transform or sweep aside an organisation which does not effect more than an increase of speed in the older manner of reform. Some already question the position of employers' representatives on a labour organisation. What, is it asked, have the employers to do with it? Are they there as users or consumers of labour power? But if so, labour is a commodity and should not be represented in the organisation, for in an international organisation to control "dumping" we should not expect to see the dumped article represented. Further, so long as the employers and the Governments form an overwhelming majority in the organisation, the problem will be regarded as one of trade rivalry and not as one of human life and limb. Labour, in fact, should be represented not as so much "power," but as men and women who are the producers

of the goods and services needed by all the world; and if it were so represented, there would be no need of a separate or special representation of the owners of capital.

Again, it is said that an international Labour Office and Conference, designed as under the draft Convention, will only provide palliatives and emendations for a social system which is already obsolete. It is not enough at this late date to keep the old machinery of exploitation going by timid reforms when friction occurs. The chaos of industry which is called the organisation of private enterprise is dependent upon poverty as an institution, upon unemployment, upon a surplus of workers, upon the domination of a few over the lives of many.* But if this is so, we need very much more effective organisation than is provided by the draft Convention. We need an international office which could initiate radical changes in the system of industry and prepare the way for the abolition of private gain as the chief incentive to the supply of goods and services.

These larger issues, however, involve criticism of the Convention which will not generally be felt. A more limited criticism has regard chiefly to the fact that not legislation but administration is the real problem in regard to the reform of labour conditions. Even if the States pass laws in agreement with international conventions, we shall still be a long way from effective reform; for inspection is still very primitive and inefficient in many States. It is sometimes corrupt and sometimes the courts to which the inspectors appeal are dominated by the interests opposed to reform. But we have not yet reached the stage of political development in which all States can be depended upon to maintain an effective inspectorate; and it would be utterly impossible at present to establish any effective international control of this kind.

The Convention, however, is recognised to be a preliminary to further action, and it cannot be expected that the Commission on Labour Legislation should have found a solution of the fundamental problem of State sovereignty. That problem stands in the way even of a League of Nations, but apparently public opinion in most countries is not yet prepared to support any departure from the administrative isolation of States, and it may very well be doubted whether the general public are yet aware of the nature of the problem. For most men the State under which they live is the largest political "category" which they can conceive. Problems other than domestic hardly appeal to their imaginations, and the world for them is still divided into ourselves and foreigners. Those few who think otherwise cannot afford to neglect the existence of this political innocence and, therefore, we cannot complain that the Commission on Labour Legislation has not achieved more than it has. Meanwhile pressure can be exerted to secure that we shall have at least not less than is implied in the draft Convention.

C. DELISLE BURNS.

* This indictment will be found, stated in moderate terms, in the Report of the Archbishops' Committee on Christianity and the Industrial System.

FINLAND'S INDEPENDENCE AND ITS RECOGNITION.

THE desire of the Finnish people to maintain their rights as an autonomous, constitutionally-governed State within the Russian Empire, and for the restoration of these rights when they had been infringed, gradually ripened into a craving for complete political independence. Tsarist Russia, and especially Russia under the last of the Romanoffs, with her policy of oppression, her repeatedly broken pledges, is primarily responsible for this change in the attitude of the Finlanders. At the outbreak of the world war it was anticipated that the Tsar would do the generous thing by Finland. Quite the reverse happened. In October, 1914, a programme for the complete Russification of Finland was published, in direct violation of the high principles of the rights of small nations proclaimed by Russia's allies.

The Russian revolution in March, 1917, seemed to inaugurate a new era. The Russian Provisional Government hastened to restore Finland's autonomy. It undoubtedly meant well, but it was powerless against the undisciplined hordes of Russian sailors and soldiers stationed in Finland, who not only repeatedly committed acts of murder and robbery, but on several occasions unwarrantably interfered in internal Finnish affairs. And if there were still waverers, the last remnant of hesitation disappeared when, in November, 1917, the Bolshevik revolution made an end to the Provisional Government under Kerensky, and started that reign of anarchy and terror of which the world has not as yet seen the end. There was now no Government in Russia to which Finland could owe allegiance, and the Finnish Government, deeming it an imperative duty to save their country from the horrors already perpetrated in Bolshevik Russia and sure to continue for an indefinite period, now found the time ripe to take the step out towards complete independence, and on its initiative the Finnish Diet, on December 6th, 1917, adopted the Declaration of Independence.

Yet Finland was not altogether to be spared the evils of Bolshevism. It was, indeed, the first country outside Russia proper to fall a victim to its allurements, which is easily accountable for by the fact that Finland was infested with Russian garrisons, numbering tens of thousands, most of them infected with Bolshevik doctrines. The Finnish "Reds" and the Russian Bolsheviks in combination brought about the Red revolt in Finland, plunging her into internal war and threatening to stifle her new-born political freedom. The Russian Soviet Government had recognised Finland's independence; it had also, as a natural corollary, promised to withdraw the Russian forces from Finland. But this promise was never fulfilled; on the contrary, the Soviet Government sent reinforcements from Russia in aid of the Red rebellion, and, in so doing, to quote Lenin's words, it hoped to reconquer Finland. The war in Finland, therefore, not merely aimed at the suppression of a rebellion; it was Finland's war of independence. And the treachery committed by the Soviet

Government has imparted additional strength to the firm determination: Never again under Russian rule! What Tsarist Russia began Bolshevik Russia has completed; and that Finland was justified in declaring her independence has been fully admitted in this country. "Great Britain," said Mr. Balfour, in January, 1918, in his reply to the Finnish Mission seeking British recognition, "fully approves the reason for Finland's independence."

After the Declaration of Independence it became one of the first duties of the Finnish Government to secure its recognition by foreign Powers. As was natural, this recognition was first to be granted by Russia. In those days people still lived under the delusion that the Russian Constituent Assembly should be allowed to convene, and its opening meeting was booked for December 11th. The Finnish Diet drew up a document to be presented to it, but as the Assembly was suppressed by the Bolsheviks it could never be delivered. However, as has been said above, the Soviet Government gave its recognition, and so did the three Scandinavian countries, France, the Central Powers, Spain, Holland, Switzerland, Greece, Argentine, Persia, and the Holy See. The recognition by France, especially, was a source of great satisfaction in Finland.

On the other hand, recognition is still withheld by Great Britain, Italy, the United States, and Japan. As for Japan, no official application to her Government has as yet been made, since the Finnish Mission entrusted with the task of seeking her recognition was prevented by the outbreak of the revolt from proceeding there. Undoubtedly there have been valid reasons for the refusal of the Powers here mentioned to grant their recognition. There was the revolt, and it seemed for a long time uncertain whether the legitimate Government, representing law and order, or the forces destructive of order, were to carry the day. In addition to the internal calamities caused by the revolt it has had disastrous consequences in regard to Finland's international relations. The atrocities committed by the Red rebels, who murdered hundreds and hundreds of unarmed people, who threatened with wholesale massacres, and who could count on the Russian fleet for the destruction of the important southern towns in Finland, and, not least, the extreme scarcity of food and the necessity of sending the "White" army, largely consisting of peasants and agricultural labourers, back to the land for the cultivation of the spring crops—all these considerations made it a matter of the greatest urgency that the revolt should be terminated with the least possible delay. In the circumstances, the Finnish Government found itself under compulsion to apply to Germany—the only Power in a position to help—for armed assistance. In so doing the Government incurred an obligation to Germany resulting in a marked German orientation, going even so far as to lead to the election of a German prince to be King of Finland. As is known, this scheme has, however, come to nought.

This attitude of the Finnish Government of those days, though supported by many Finlanders, gave rise to grave anxiety in large sections of the people. General Mannerheim, the Commander-in-

Chief of the Finnish Army during the revolt, found himself unable to co-operate with the German military elements in Finland, and shortly after the suppression of the insurrection he resigned his command. The circumstances leading to his resignation were deeply resented by public opinion, which regarded Mannerheim as a national hero, the liberator of Finland from the Bolshevik danger. This greatly contributed to the dissatisfaction with the *régime* then prevailing in Finland, and when finally it became evident that Germany would lose the war, the Government more than ever found its position untenable and resigned. General Mannerheim, the scion of an old Swedish-Finnish family, was elected Regent, and an entirely new Government was appointed.

With General Mannerheim's acceptance of the Regency the German orientation in Finland came to an end, and the enthusiasm with which he was greeted everywhere in his tours through Finland furnishes eloquent proof of the people's hearty support of the policy he represents. The Allied Powers, also, appear to appreciate the new Regent's attitude, since coincidentally with Mannerheim's acceptance of the Regency they have released the food supplies so sorely needed in Finland.

The objections against the recognition of Finland's independence which I have briefly outlined above should, therefore, seem to have been removed. But are there, then, no positive reasons in favour of recognition? I think there are. In this country, at any rate, an almost universal opinion, Conservative, Liberal, Socialist, more or less emphatically holds the view that Bolshevism is an evil—the evil of evils. For every inch of ground that Bolshevism gains, inside Russia and outside, the sense of danger for European civilisation grows in intensity, and every time reports come in about a Bolshevik reverse, they are received with relief. A year ago Finland was engaged in a life and death struggle with Bolshevism, and if, through the sacrifice of thousands of human lives, the law-abiding population had not succeeded in defeating it, an area as extensive as the whole of Great Britain and Ireland, with Belgium and Holland thrown in, would have been added to the Bolshevik sphere of influence, and a population of over three millions subjected to its rule of blood and iron. Primarily, of course, Finland herself has gained by it; but next to Finland her western neighbours, Sweden, Norway, and even Denmark, benefit by the defeat by Finland of Bolshevism. Elements making for a Bolshevik *régime* are by no means lacking in those countries, and if Finland had come under Bolshevik rule those elements would have received a dangerous encouragement. And not only that. The remarkable tendencies of expansion characteristic of Bolshevism would undoubtedly have led to an attempt to spring over the boundaries separating a Bolshevik Finland from Sweden and Norway, and it is easily conceivable that Lenin's adherents would have invaded the territories of these countries. Probably the sound Scandinavian population would have been able to defeat an advance of this kind; but through the victory of "White" Finland over the "Red" forces the Scandinavian countries have been spared the contingency of a sanguinary internal war.

In stemming the spread of Bolshevik madness Finland has rendered human civilisation services which, I venture to submit, should be placed on the credit side of her balance-sheet. And her rôle in this respect is not played out yet. On the southern side of the Gulf of Finland Finnish volunteers have with great gallantry helped their kinsmen, the Esthonians, in their fight with Bolshevism. On the northern side of the Gulf Finland now stands as the easternmost outpost against Bolshevik Russia, and she must constantly be on the alert, for though the Red revolt was crushed, a very active underground propaganda for a renewal of the revolt is being carried out both in Finland and on the Russian side east of the frontier by Red Finns and Bolshevik Russians. In the rebellion some 70,000 or 80,000 Red prisoners were taken, and, with the exception of 6,000 still in prison, and a few who were executed—they only number 59—the others have been conditionally released. Though the majority of them probably have been cured of Bolshevism, there are still many left who are bent on revenge for their defeat. Several thousands of the Reds fled to Russia, where they are now plotting against their native country. Some of these have taken service with the British forces on the Murmansk, including several of their most prominent leaders, such as Mr. O. Tokoi, once Socialist Premier in a Finnish Cabinet. This Tokoi, and six other Red leaders, actually had the hardihood to contend, in a proclamation smuggled over to Finland last autumn, that the Finnish detachment in the British Army intended, with the assistance of the British forces, to invade Finland and resuscitate the Red revolt. It is precisely this detachment which has now, in April, attempted, or perhaps carried out, a mutiny against the British forces. From time to time we read in the Finnish papers reports about Bolshevik agitation in Finland, and the following extract from a London paper of April 15th is highly suggestive:—

“A plot to blow up the officers’ mess and the important railway bridge at St. Andreæ and ammunition stores has been discovered at Viborg, Finland. Eight notorious Bolsheviks were arrested. Their scheme was to start a revolution at the end of April or the beginning of May, simultaneously with a Bolshevik attack on Finland. According to the arrested men’s statements, revolts had been planned both in Sweden and Norway.”

The reference to the revolts in Sweden and Norway is specially interesting.

It is in the interest of Europe, of human civilisation, of democracy such as it is understood in this country, that Finland should be strong enough to resist an advance of Bolshevism over her boundaries. She has already had her share of bloodshed and suffering from this cause, and she has a right to be placed in a position to prevent even an attempt at a repetition of what she has undergone, not only for her own sake, but in her rôle as a defensive bulwark, for the benefit of other countries, against Bolshevism. For this end she is in need of support. If a Bolshevik attack is made on her, she may require material support; but as a preventive measure moral support from the Allied Powers will be of the highest

value. No better and more effective form for this support could be found than the recognition of Finland's independence.

If there is any one man in the North of Europe who has deserved better than any other single individual in withstanding and paralysing the evil effects of this world disease, it is the Commander of the Finnish Government forces in the Red rebellion, General Mannerheim. In his new exalted position as Regent of Finland, and once more in command of her Army, Mannerheim stands out as the supreme guardian against the forces destructive of civilised society. His great popularity among his fellow countrymen stands him in good stead. But popular favour is ever a fickle thing. When Mannerheim took over the Regency, two things above all were expected of him. One was to secure food; in this he has succeeded. The other was to get full international guarantees of Finland's independence, and here popular expectations have been so far disappointed. After the new elections in March last the Finnish Ministers have tendered their resignation to the Regent, and a new Cabinet has to be formed in closer conformity with the present party balance. The new Diet numbers 80 Socialists out of a total of 200 members; there are Republicans and Monarchists; there is the element representing the Swedish population and their special interests, and there are many cross currents of political opinion. It is no easy task to appoint a Cabinet which will even reasonably satisfy these conflicting interests, and at the time of writing (middle of April) negotiations to this end are still going on. Before this paper appears in print no doubt the new Government will have been established, but it will be a Government where discordant notes may be expected to turn up. Fortunately Finland possesses in the Regent, whose aloofness from party politics is generally admitted, a central figure which makes for unity. But he requires all the moral strength he can command, and for reasons set forth above it is not merely a Finnish interest: it is a matter of European interest that his position should be made strong and his prestige unassailable. There is no better way of doing this than to remove the popular disappointment in regard to the full international guarantees of Finland's independence.

In January, 1918, Mr. Balfour declared that Great Britain's recognition of Finland's independence depends "either upon a favourable view by consolidated Russian political power or continued disorder in Russia." The second alternative has been amply fulfilled; disorder in Russia has continued and still continues. And the time seems far off when political power will have consolidated to such an extent and in such a direction as to meet the approval and recognition of the Allied Powers. If, and when, such a state of order and tranquillity is once more restored in Russia, the part Finland has played and is playing in her resistance to disorder will be admitted to have contributed her share to this end. Finland at present gives shelter to many thousands of Russians who have fled from the Bolshevik horrors, and many of whom probably would have perished but for the refuge accorded them in Finland, and this at the time when the country was on the verge of starvation. These refugees belong largely to the

elements of the Russian people who, if any, will be capable of building up a new Russia. And in their constructive policy Finland may be able to aid them; but she will have more power to do so if her own international status is fully established. Again, if, and when, Russian political power will be consolidated, what will her complexion be, what her ideals? Will there be a reactionary *régime*? Can Finland be sure of a favourable view being taken by it? These are doubts which in Finland create an atmosphere of anxiety, and make it a question of the gravest importance that her sovereignty should be recognised independently of such precarious contingencies.

To sum up: the reasons for Finland's independence are admittedly valid; the conditions in Finland which have caused a delay in the recognition have ceased to exist; Finland has deserved well of the defenders of civilisation against the Bolshevik evil; Finland is at the present day in charge of an important mission to stand guard against the further advance of this evil; it is in the interest of Europe that she should be made strong to fulfil this mission; she is in need of moral support, and therefore, of the recognition of her independence.

I have in the course of this paper once or twice quoted Mr. Balfour; one more quotation:—

“Mr. Balfour assured the Finnish Mission that he was convinced that Finland would soon take her place for ever among the sovereign nations.”

J. N. REUTER.

NATIONAL HEALTH.

PROPOSALS for improving the central machinery of government in relation to the national health are under consideration: and these proposals—and still more the measures so greatly needed to improve the local machinery for the same purpose, by consolidation and unification of local authorities—have important bearing on the possibility of more rapid progress in public health administration. The present paper is not concerned, however, with this aspect of the problem, but with the improved personal and national outlook on National Health which requires to be correlated with administrative reforms, if the latter are to have a reasonable prospect of becoming effective.

The results already secured by the practical application of public hygiene in its widest scope are apt to be overlooked in the earnest endeavour after further achievements. In a calculation recently published in an official report I showed that on an average during each year in the period 1910-12, there occurred in England and Wales, 234,955 fewer deaths than would have occurred, had the population been subjected to the death-rates holding good in the period 1871-80; and this annual saving of *lives* each year meant that the persons whose lives were thus saved had the prospect of living in the aggregate of 9,612,600 additional *years of life*. Social and sanitary improvements have already secured for the English population an annual gain of nearly ten million years of life. During the last ten years, especially, a remarkable improvement has taken place: for instance, the number of notified cases of enteric or typhoid fever in England and Wales in 1911 was 13,582, while the corresponding number in 1917 was only 4,601. Enteric fever is rapidly becoming as rare a disease as typhus fever has already become. The above results show that prior to the World War, there had been a rapidly increasing realisation of the importance of public hygiene; and in bringing this about the work of medical officers of health and other public health officials must be given first place in our meed of thanks.

The terrible losses of life and health incurred during the recent World War have brought home to all the still great need for economising life, and for improving the prospects of healthy childhood and youth. The total deaths among our soldiers and sailors during the war have numbered about 836,000, including men from the United Kingdom and from all British possessions; while the number of deaths in the civilian population of England and Wales during the first four years of the war were over two million. True, most of the deaths among our armed forces were of men in early manhood and the most virile of the Empire; but even among the civilian population it is noteworthy that in 1916, for instance, of the 508,217 deaths registered in the civilian population of England and Wales, 109,966 occurred during the first five years after birth, 141,112 at all ages under 20, 299,873 at all ages under 60; while the deaths at ages over 70 only numbered 122,289, or 24 per cent. of the total number of civilian deaths during the year. Of the total deaths at ages under 60, there is no practical doubt that, given the system-

atic and universal application of the hygienic knowledge which is already in our possession, at least one-third, and probably one-half could be avoided ; and deaths at ages prior to the acknowledged span of life could be reduced to a fraction of their present number.

The unnecessary mortality briefly indicated above coincides with a vast mass of unnecessary sickness, the removal of which would do more to diminish the amount of poverty and misery in our midst than any other single remedial measure.

The prospect of securing increased and more scientific effort against disease has been greatly improved by war experience. Nothing has been more gratifying than the immense advance at home while war has been raging over-seas, in organised efforts for preserving child-life, and for improving the health of both mother and child. This work has been done by local authorities, and by various educational and voluntary agencies ; and the success of these efforts and the active co-operation of the public secured for them give ample reason for expecting, as the result of their continuance and extension, a great improvement in the standard of national health. Similar remarks apply in regard to the prevention and treatment of venereal diseases, concerning which the public have recently become enlightened to an unexampled extent ; and in every chief centre of population arrangements have been organised for the treatment of patients suffering from these diseases.

The prevention of alcoholism has similarly been made the subject of practical experimentation in restrictions of supply of alcoholic drinks, and in restrictions of hours during which such drinks are obtainable, which, if our legislators are wise, will be embodied and extended in the future life of the nation.

These three instances serve to illustrate the general truth that, as a nation, we have been learning more rapidly than at any previous period to apply existent social and medical knowledge to the scientific treatment and prevention of disease, and to secure a higher standard of health, especially for mothers and their children. They serve further to illustrate the complexity of causation and prevention of disease, to illustrate which is the main object of this paper ; and it is convenient to take the case of venereal diseases for more detailed consideration, as it serves to bring out very strongly the inter-dependence of the causes of these diseases, and therefore of the means to be taken against them. The measures indicated for the prevention of venereal diseases illustrate well the complexity of their causation and of the conditions of success. The circumstances making early marriage difficult for a large section of the community increase the risk of these diseases. In advising chastity, which is the one safe and legitimate means of avoiding the chief source of venereal disease, we are concerned with one of the strongest of human passions ; and the control of this passion is part of the general problem of self-control, in which parents, tutors, religious teachers, and the young person concerned must each bear their part to ensure success. Boys, especially students, often fall victims to temptation under the influence of a night in town with companions who encourage unaccustomed alcoholic indulgence. In other instances domestic overcrowding has led to sexual vice ; but more

influential than this is the defective home control, the failure of mothers in relation to the moral training of their children. A large part of the responsibility for the transmission of venereal disease must be borne by imperfect police legislation and administration. Temptation is flaunted before young people; the definition of brothels is too limited, and they are inadequately controlled; and legislation is needed against the knowing communication of venereal disease.

Until three years ago medical arrangements for treating and thus preventing the spread of venereal disease were most unsatisfactory; and the patient from desire for secrecy, went to ill-qualified practitioners and to druggists or herbalists who failed to eradicate the constitutional infection. The prohibition of the treatment of venereal disease by unqualified persons, and the establishment of special treatment centres in our large centres of population are now breaking the chain of infection in a rapidly increasing proportion of cases. Treatment is being applied in many instances before symptoms of infection appear: and there is at the present time agitation for the provision of disinfectant outfits beforehand which will render promiscuity relatively safe. This is a tempting "short cut" in breaking the chain of causation, which, I think, is foredoomed to failure under civilian conditions of life; and even were it otherwise grave issues are raised; and it may well be that success—it could at best only be partial—by this short route will in the long run spell moral failure with further disease in its train. This incomplete enumeration of conditions favouring venereal diseases, and of means for their elimination, illustrates the many points at which an evil like this needs to be attacked. Complete success cannot be assured unless medical, educational, social, and religious workers combine in converging effort to the same end; and such combined effort is not practicable if the moral sense of a large section of the community is offended by specious "short-cut" remedies. Given co-operative work in regard to housing, to diminution of alcoholic temptations, to improved and stricter police regulations, and especially given the building up of better parental influence, there is no reason why syphilis should not become as rare as enteric fever, or even as typhus fever, which in this country is at the point of extinction. We are dealing with a vicious circle of influences; but a vicious circle has one excellent virtue. It can be snapped at different points, as opportunity best serves, and the sequence of events can thus be inhibited. The greatest hope of success is secured when workers at different parts of the circle co-operate for the common end.

It is well to avoid the common assumption that the maxim, "Prevention is better than cure," implies an absence of preventive qualities in treatment. That this is not so, is illustrated in all branches of medicine; and it is a lesson which needs to be impressed on the public mind as forcibly as the value of measures of direct prevention. The treatment under satisfactory conditions of the tuberculous patient in the earlier stages of his illness not only improves his condition and his prospect of lasting health; it also diminishes the

risks of his family and his industrial and his recreative associates acquiring tuberculosis. Expenditure on the treatment of patients with advanced tuberculosis is even more important in the interest of the community, and at the same time secures for the patient the best available nursing and medical attendance. Similarly in the treatment of syphilis, administration of the various arseno-benzol preparations—606, &c.—destroys in a phenomenally short period the maleficent spirochaetes of this disease, and thus puts an end—at least for some months—to the patient's power to spread disease.

The National (Health) Insurance Act embodied in its title the same ideal, but the treatment so far developed under it—with the partial exception of the Sanatorium Benefit—has not been marked by its preventive value. This means that hitherto, unfortunately—there are happy exceptions—medical practice has not been so organised as to secure for every patient the advantage of all available aids to physical and laboratory diagnosis, and of such home nursing, expert consultations, and special hospital treatment as may be needed. These illustrations, and others which will doubtless occur to the reader, show that treatment holds within its scope many hitherto imperfectly developed possibilities of prevention of disease.

It would be folly, however, to rest contented with developing the possibilities of more scientific, prompter, and more adequate treatment of illness; when, so far as concerns a large mass of existent disease, actual prevention is within reach. Prevention of disease implies an accurate knowledge of its causation, and the close and general correspondence between excessive sickness and poverty must be obvious even to the most casual observer. We are, therefore, driven by practical needs to combat poverty when attacking disease, if the possibilities of rational prevention of either are to be realised. There is nothing new in this problem. The suggested obligation to attempt the eradication of poverty is not modern in origin. St. Augustine said: "Thou givest bread to the hungry, but better were it that none hungered and thou hadst none to give to him." At almost every point the closeness of the association between poverty and disease emerges, whether we consider this association in terms of housing, of nutrition, of means of warmth, of opportunities for infection, of overwork, or of neglected symptoms of illness. Poverty and disease act interchangeably as cause and effect, and in considering causes, with a view to their removal, we find that these causes constitute a chain of events the end links of which not infrequently are joined to form a circle.

Poverty is due to many causes; and different observers will attach a varying degree of importance to such factors as orphanage, widowhood, poorly paid occupation, accident, sickness, old age, drink, immorality, shiftlessness, crime. Nor is it difficult to understand that many of these causes of poverty are, in fact, its results, or symptoms indicating its presence; they are, however, most potent in producing more poverty. It cannot be said that this incomplete enumeration of the factors of poverty

satisfies the scientific mind ; but there is comfort in remembering that removal of the conditions leading to poverty may serve in practice to produce rapid amelioration, even when we cannot reach back to its ultimate causes. When we know, for instance, that something like one-third of all the deaths that leave women with young children without a husband's and father's support are due to tuberculosis, and that this disease is commonly handed on by infection as a legacy to the children, we must realise that no carefully devised and satisfactorily carried out efforts to prevent this disease and to treat it satisfactorily can be too difficult to be undertaken. These efforts may necessitate wages for the weakly worker above his market value; they may mean monetary assistance in paying the rent of an additional bedroom; and, as I have recently stated in an official report, will need to embrace the whole of the sick life of the consumptive patient, and not merely patches of it, as at present.

Poverty itself is one of the greatest causes of poverty: which is no new discovery, for "the wealth of the rich is their strong city; the destruction of the poor is their poverty." Thus the poverty of the parent leads to the premature employment of children; their growth is dwarfed, their frame weakened, and there follows diminished adult efficiency; which itself again is a fertile cause of poverty. Similarly poverty often leads to malnutrition; infection thus has an open door provided for it; illness results; on recovery there is often permanent reduction of earning capacity leading to further poverty, and so the circle is complete. Instances of such circular evils will occur to all.

But even this statement is not altogether satisfactory; for there is also much poverty of essentials of health, which is not caused by the too common under-payment for work done and by the defective distribution of the rewards of industry. In many families with adequate incomes wives and children are being underfed and insufficiently clad, and mothers are also being overworked, because parents have not had satisfactory moral and intellectual training in their life work: they are shiftless, or dissolute, and money is wasted in drink, or gambling, or other dissipation which should have been spent week by week in raising the general standard of family life.

The relation between conduct and health is almost as intimate as that between poverty and disease. This is true in both a communal and a personal sense. The movement for improving national health which has already been so fruitful has been largely a measure of the sensitisation of the consciences of the people. Legislation and even public health administration carry us only a limited distance unless they are backed by public opinion, which in effect means the conscience of the majority of the population. It would be easy to show, were this not somewhat wide of the present discussion, that although ignorance to a diminishing extent is still rampant in all classes, carelessness, shiftlessness, self-indulgence, lack of moral courage, are even more potent causes of disease and inefficiency in the community. The illness caused by intemperance in food and drink, by the exploitation of the work of the young and of underpaid workers at all ages, by the owners of insanitary

dwellings, by the purveyors of unsound and chemicalised foods, by prostitution and promiscuous sexual intercourse, are instances in which regardless misconduct more than ignorance is involved.

The earliest sanitary code known to us, that of the Jewish race, was an intrinsic part of their religion; and in modern times it may, I think, be contended that duty, honour, and chivalry have been more effective stimuli in the direction of improved national health than motives derived from considerations of self-interest or of the general economic value of health.

A higher ideal in health matters can be cultivated; public opinion can be trained; but the enactment of compulsory reform which does not carry with it the public spirit of the nation must always in large measure fail. It is in non-realisation of this factor that social enthusiasts not infrequently fail. They are impatient of delay, and are often unwilling to undertake the necessary missionary work on voluntary committees and at the meetings of local authorities. The present local authorities are too numerous, and their unnecessary multiplicity is a serious obstacle to progress. But much more would be done even under existing conditions if rancorous and ill-informed criticism were avoided, and if active co-operation with appreciation of what is being done replaced it. Nothing has made it so difficult to secure the continued services of good men to undertake the burden of local government as the uncharitable and indiscriminating criticism aimed at those engaged in it. Exact knowledge of local conditions on the part of every citizen is needed to ensure the needed co-operation; and without a high moral ideal on the part of onlookers as well as of administrators the further triumphs of preventive medicine, now possible, will fail to be secured.

ARTHUR NEWSHOLME.

IRELAND PAST AND PRESENT.

THE business of governing Ireland would be simple enough, if those who rebel against constituted authority were clearly persons of criminal mind. For then they could be proceeded against with a good conscience and with the assent of those quiet citizens who (believe me) form the majority even in Ireland. But it becomes very much more complicated when the career of such a man as Sir Charles Gavan Duffy is taken into account. For Duffy, the rebel and transported "felon," who lived to become the loyal servant of the Crown he had once defied, made (and this is the essence of the matter) no capitulation of his principles.

"I will soon have to give an account of my whole life," he once declared to the Parliament of Victoria, "and I feel that it has been defaced by many sins and shortcomings, but there is one portion of it I must except from this censure. . . . I am challenged to justify myself for having been an Irish rebel, under penalty of your fatal censure, and I am content to reply that the recollection that when my country was in mortal peril I was amongst those who staked life for her deliverance, is a memory I would not exchange for anything that Parliaments or Sovereigns can give or take away." And his case is by no means singular. No one can read the utterances and learn the story of Lord Edward Fitzgerald, of Robert Emmett, of John O'Leary (to cite but a few among many) without realising that each in his own way was a great soul distraught by what he conceived to be an intolerable wrong. For the men of past generations this will perhaps be admitted. "Your fathers stoned the prophets, and ye build their sepulchres." It is easy to forgive oneself the error of others. But can we be confident that the ultimate verdict will be substantially different in respect of the rebels of to-day? Read that queer fragment of autobiography, "The Story of a Success," by Patrick Pearse, or even James Connolly's "Labour in Irish History," and ask yourself whether these men would have rebelled against a well-ordered State.

Remember there is here no question of justifying rebellion either in general or in particular. Remember also that exactly in proportion to the disappearance of those more obvious grievances which precipitated previous insurrections the puzzle grows "why Irishmen not deficient in public spirit and probity are eager to break away from the Union and from all connection with England." Mr. Gladstone at one time seems to have come to the strange conclusion that he could destroy Fenianism by disestablishing the Irish Protestant Church. Later on he and others (with more reason) thought to have struck at the roots of discontent through reform of the Land Laws. To-day it is plain that, salutary as these measures were in themselves, they were not enough to reconcile Irishmen to the British connection. If then we can to-day attribute this restlessness neither to manifest wrongs nor to inherent wickedness, we must search deeper for the causes of Irish discontent.

“Good government”—and who really enjoys it?—“is no substitute for self-government.” Once let national consciousness reach a certain stage of development and it becomes a hunger which if unsatisfied preoccupies the mind and tortures the body of the community in question. Happy the citizens of Nation States to whom national self-expression is so much a matter of course that their citizens are as unconscious of it as is the healthy man of his digestion. To them Patriotism and Loyalty are one and the same thing. With what difficulty can Englishmen imagine a state of affairs in which to be English would be to be “disloyal”!

So remote indeed from English thought is such a conception, that I despair of conveying any idea of that disastrous clash of conflicting calls of which most Irishmen are only too keenly aware in their own consciences. But perhaps it may be of some little use to trace the stages through which the conception of a distinct Irish Nationality has passed. It may at any rate help us to resolve the puzzle above mentioned. To progress in charity is something. If we understand and forgive, perhaps we shall begin to see our way more clearly. “To-day is the child and heir of yesterday.”

As I read Irish History—others read it otherwise—the conception of “Ireland a Nation” is, comparatively speaking, modern. I am not competent to discuss whether a real national consciousness existed in Gaelic Ireland. What seems to be clear at any rate is that from the twelfth to the seventeenth century, the mind of Ireland was filled with family or clan, racial, religious, or dynastic, rather than truly national, ideas. Strangely enough, it was from the ranks of the English colonists, the “new foreigners” of Gaelic historians, that the doctrine of modern Nationalism was first preached, a doctrine restricted indeed in its immediate application but capable, as events have shown, of enlargement.

For Swift, Molyneux and Lucas the Irish Nation consisted, for all practical purposes, in that Ascendancy which the Revolution of 1689 created; nor perhaps did any larger conception trouble the minds of most members even of the Free Parliament of 1782. For generations the law (as laid down from the Bench) had “not supposed such a person to exist as an Irish Roman Catholic” except for purposes of repression. But one by one the old penal Acts were repealed or allowed to fall into disuse; and at last, in 1793, the Catholics, who two years earlier had joined with their Protestant comrades in the Volunteer movement, were admitted to the franchise, and thus (though still debarred from entering Parliament itself) recognised as citizens not outlaws. The claims which the Colonists had made on their own behalf were now tacitly extended to cover the whole people of Ireland.

Then came the movement of the “United Irishmen” (“a brotherhood of affection, a union of power”) the first combination on equal terms of Catholic and Protestant. The movement was quenched in blood; but its fundamental ideas remained rooted in the minds of Irishmen. In the succeeding years indeed the Protestant gentry were drawn increasingly into the more attractive sphere of English political life, and the descendants of the

republican enthusiasts of Belfast became a new Ascendancy. Under O'Connell's leadership the demand for repeal of the Union became more and more identified with the Catholic Party who alone, as a body, remained faithful to the doctrines (essentially similar, though accidentally divergent) of Grattan, Lord Edward Fitzgerald and Wolfe Tone. I say "essentially similar" because Grattan, though devoted to the British Connection, yet placed Irish interests first, and because the others, though they sought in arms to destroy that connection, did so only when they despaired of constitutional reform. The lives of all these three, and the deaths of Tone and Edward Fitzgerald, had created a covenant between Catholic and Protestant Irishmen, and given to Nationalism a new meaning. Obscured for a while, this meaning was revealed once more in that "Young Ireland" movement which has been the inspiration of all succeeding generations.

Superficially considered, there is not a little resemblance between Young Ireland and Sinn Fein. The name "Sinn Fein" itself was obviously suggested by one of the most popular of the verses published in the "Nation" newspaper; Sinn Fein Clubs were modelled upon those of 1848; the Sinn Fein policy of returning for Parliamentary Constituencies persons who refuse to attend at Westminster was anticipated by the Young Ireland "Council of the Three Hundred." What is more to the purpose, in each case a movement in its origin educational and literary rather than political, passes by rapid stages into open revolt against the authority of the Crown. And for the transformation the same cause may be assigned—namely, the unwillingness or incompetence of the Government of the day to do justice. Everyone knows how Ulster's open defiance of Parliamentary authority, supported as it was by a great part of English Society and encouraged by the inaction of the Executive, awoke in Nationalist Ireland the dormant idea of physical force. Just so the Rebellion of 1848 was born of the despair engendered by the Great Famine, when thousands lay down to die while the cornships bore the grain they had reaped away from Irish ports, and fostered by the declaration of the Government of the day that though all Ireland demanded the abolition of a system of administration which permitted such horrors to occur, that demand would never be conceded. In each case again, a body of young men without political experience are found in opposition to the acknowledged leader of Irish democracy. And the critics of 1918 as of 1848 accused the Parliamentary leader, Redmond as O'Connell, of an excessive leaning towards English (as distinguished from Irish) interests. As one of O'Connell's chief opponents afterwards frankly acknowledged,* conflicts of this kind are inevitable, since young and ardent spirits are naturally intolerant of those compromises which are forced upon the Parliamentarian, by the very nature of the medium in which he works. Such compromises often appear to the enthusiast outside the political arena as a betrayal of the sacred cause. One knows how often the

* Gavan Duffy in *Young Ireland*.

Labour leader or the Trades Union official is attacked in this fashion by critics ignorant or regardless of his difficulties. And this tendency is all the stronger where not merely two classes but two nations are in conflict.

Finally, in each case events upon the Continent of Europe precipitated the catastrophe. In 1848 as in 1916 thrones were tottering, and the successful establishment of the Second French Republic affected men's minds in a manner with which we have again become familiar in our own days.

So far, as it seems to me, the parallel holds, not without instruction and warning. Were we willing to learn anything from the teachings of the past, we might profit by seeing how similar errors always produce similar evils. Popular leaders might then be willing to depend more on the political education of their followers and less upon the party machine, and rulers might listen more readily to claims based rather on justice than on the imminent threat of physical force.

But if there are striking resemblances between the Young Ireland and the Sinn Fein movements there are profound differences also. Thomas Davis and his fellows were as eager to keep for Ireland the sympathies of France and of America as De Valera and his associates to alienate them. And though they taught Irishmen to rely upon themselves rather than upon the professed goodwill of British politicians nothing could be less in accord with the "spirit of the Nation" than that alliance with Prussian despotism of which Sinn Fein was not ashamed to boast. Davis, Duffy and Smith O'Brien were men who cared greatly for Liberty—and not in Ireland only but wherever that principle was at stake.

Among the Young Irishmen themselves, one may, it seems to me, discern three groups. On the right stand the three original founders of the "Nation" newspaper, Thomas Davis, Gavan Duffy and John Blake Dillon. From them are descended the Constitutional Nationalists of to-day, advocates of reform and reconciliation. Next, John Mitchell, that angry, bitter spirit, who hated England more than he loved either Ireland or human freedom. By him, alas, alone of his contemporaries, does Sinn Fein seem inspired. It is significant that during the two years before the Rebellion, Patrick Pearse, President of the ill-fated Provisional Government, had as his constant companion in his solitary walks (as one who knew him well has told me) Mitchell's "Jail Journal." Lastly, we have the "strange hunch-back of genius," James Fintan Lalor, who first saw the necessity of linking with the political claims of Ireland economic, and especially agrarian reform. For the first time, through his mouth, the poor men and women of Ireland speak to us in their own way, and no longer through interpreters. How significant in the light of after events is his appeal to the Irish gentry to take their places at the head of the popular movement! "Remember," he told the Irish landlords, "that Ireland is your mother-country, and her people, your people; that her interest and honour, her gain and glory, are counted as your own; . . . that henceforth you will be not a foreign garrison but a national guard. . . . Adopt this principle

and you are armed; on it is your safety and your strength. Ireland is yours for ages yet, on the condition that you will be Irishmen—in name, in faith, in fact. Refuse it, and you commit yourselves, in the position of paupers, to the mercy of English ministers and English members; you throw your very existence on English support, which England soon may find too costly to afford. You lie at the feet of events; you lie in the way of the people—and the movement of events and the march of a people shall be over you.”

In the seventy years which have elapsed since the Great Famine dug a chasm between the old and the new Ireland, Irish nationalism has developed steadily along the lines laid down by one or other of the Young Ireland circle. Mitchell's gospel of hate has twice found renewed expression in the insurrections of 1867 and 1916: Lalor's vision has been realised in the foundation of the Land League by Michael Davitt and in the subsequent revolution in land tenure; the separation of Irish parliamentary action from the entanglements of British party achieved by Parnell.

Meanwhile, Isaac Butt had given a new shape to the national demand, substituting for simple Repeal of the Union the policy for which he found the name “Home Rule.” It was now seen to be possible, retaining one sovereign Parliament for the United Kingdom and thus avoiding the possible occurrence of such disputes as arose over the Regency question during the illness of George III., to give to an Irish legislature and executive full control over all purely Irish affairs. Such, without substantial modification, has been the programme of the constitutionalist movement from that day to this.

At their inception Butt's proposals were welcomed by many of the southern gentry and of the Protestant inhabitants of Ulster. The Land War of the eighties and an unhappy revival of sectarian animosities have for a generation again estranged these two bodies of Irishmen from the national cause. But within the past few years there have been signs of a new reconciliation. Since the assembling of the Convention the Southern Unionists—or at least a large number of them—have drawn nearer to their Nationalist fellow-countrymen. In Ulster the official attitude appears little if at all changed, but under the surface forces are working which, perhaps before and most certainly after a settlement, are bound to transform the situation. Though Ireland is, and is likely to remain, predominantly agricultural, class-consciousness is growing there as elsewhere among the manual workers of the towns. The political alliance between working-men north and south and “capitalists,” whether Catholic or Protestant, is the artificial product of causes which are already ceasing to operate; and to the sense of this rather than to religious or racial fears is perhaps due the desperate efforts of the Ulster employer to stave off a settlement of the Constitutional issue. James Connolly aimed not merely at the political independence of Ireland, but at “her re-conversion to the Gaelic principle of common ownership by a people of the sources of food and maintenance.”

As we look back, then, over the pages of Irish history two or three big facts stand out from the mass of encumbering detail.

First and foremost there is the constancy of the Irish claim to national self-expression. The protagonists are changed; individuals fall away; sections of the people pursue particularist aims. Now this class, now that—the Gael or the Norman, the Anglo-Irish chieftains, the leaders of the Protestant Ascendancy, the Presbyterians of Belfast, the Catholic peasantry, professional men, industrial workers—are in the van of the fight. The immediate interest shifts from the land and back again, centres for a while on trade restrictions, or Parliamentary Reform, or Catholic disabilities. But through it all, in this shape or that, is visible the same longing of Irishmen to be allowed to manage their own affairs. Never has the succession of witnesses to Ireland's claim to nationhood been broken.

In the second place, we see clearly that nothing but satisfaction given to this claim can have any effect in allaying discontent. One after another, each minor cause of controversy has been settled. Jealous interference with Irish trade has long ceased, and the old savage anti-Catholic laws have long been abolished. The old evil system of land tenure has followed tithe-exactions into disuse, if not yet into oblivion. Nevertheless, reform in these matters has not, as many expected, brought peace between England and Ireland.

Next, at each successive stage of the national struggle (at least since the end of the eighteenth century) two tendencies are continually struggling for mastery within the Nationalist ranks. There is the party of those who seek to vindicate Ireland's claim by peaceful organisation and argument and that of those who rely chiefly on physical force. But again, these sections, though opposed, tend also to transfuse one another. On the extreme right are a few who under no circumstances whatever are willing to counsel or participate in violent courses; on the extreme left, a few who are rightly called irreconcilable. Between them, at all times, in 1798, in 1848, in 1867, in 1919, stand the great mass of essentially moderate persons who are swayed this way or that as hope or despair predominates among them. And to this great class has belonged not merely the general body of Nationalists, but even the majority of insurrectionary leaders. Thus, for instance, Smith O'Brien—an aristocrat, a Conservative, the most constitutionally-minded of men—found himself, after long discouraging any recourse to physical force, the leader of the Rebellion of 1848. Thus, on the other hand, many of the "old Fenians" of 1867 were in later life won back to the side of constitutionalism by the emergence of a strong Parliamentary movement under Parnell. To come to our own times, no one who has followed with any care the story of the last six years will believe that the rising of 1916 would have taken place, had English statesmen shown a little more understanding and foresight. Still less can anyone who remembers Ireland as she was before the war, doubt that if a majority of Irishmen has swung round once more towards the revolutionary side, it is not so much because it believes in revolution as because it despairs of reform. Pearse and his companions, perverse and mischievous as was their action, sought

and found death, that Ireland, according to their reading of events, might live. By this single act, they raised themselves in the imagination of their countrymen to a place in a long procession of Irish martyrs. That in the blindness of their despair they, who sought liberty should have allied themselves with the foulest tyranny which ever cursed the world, is a tragic satire upon English stupidity and Irish folly.

Finally, we may learn from the past that the Irish question is not one of merely domestic concern. One may live in a little island, cut off from Europe by the estranging sea, and half forgotten. Our politics for a generation may seem to be no more than a sordid struggle between contending factions. But of a sudden, barricades in a Paris street, or the murder of an Austrian Archduke in a far-off Bosnian town—and on the instant Ireland, with her unsatisfied desire for freedom, leaps into the foreground of international disputes. Friendships are compromised, alliances in peril, because England, “the champion of Nationalities” (how bitterly John Mitchell’s words ring in our ears!), has not yet known how to win the friendship of this little nation at her gates.

It is but just to add that she does now appear sincerely to desire that friendship. But delay of justice imposes penalties both on the wronged and the wrong-doer; and the effects of past injustice are not to be undone in a day. The mind of Ireland has been warped and twisted. Much patience and imagination—above all much knowledge of “whys” and “hows”—will be required of all of us if the two peoples, so long estranged, are to be knit in an enduring reconciliation.

To that reconciliation the United States of America can bring most powerful assistance; and should a happy ending to an age-long quarrel be ultimately due, as seems likely, to the efforts of American statesmen, both England and Ireland will have new cause to bless the name of that great Republic in which so many millions of their sons have found a home.

HUGH A. LAW.

OVERSEAS SOLDIERS IN BRITISH HOMES.

DURING the year 1916 London first began to note in her streets the presence of those tall, loose-limbed giants with the open gaze and the splendid walk of free men, whom she has since learned to know so well. The Australians have since then "made good" on many a blood-stained field; but their size and their ubiquity became at that time a vague source of trouble to the smaller Londoner. He wondered why those men with the slouch hats and the easy fitting costumes were always in the streets—why they took up so much room in the 'buses—why they sat in rows, Neapolitan fashion, on the stone parapets of Trafalgar Square. Perhaps he forgot that they hailed from sunny climes and even in London wooed the light and the warmth. Perhaps, too, he failed to remember that these lads were young. Nor is it quite certain that he bore in mind that they were far—very far—from home.

I remember on a day in that year hailing one of these giants in the heart of London. "Well, Sonny, how's life?" "Bad," he said, "very lone." "How's that?" "Well, one thing is my home is 12,000 miles off." "But how about the Kiosks and the Hostels, aren't they very kind to you there?" "Very kind," he said, "but it's not what we want." "Then what do you want?" "We want Home," he said, very simply. There was the heart of the trouble.

I put the Australians to the front because they were furthest from their own country and because, after the first batch, most of them were Australian-born men who had few friends in this country. But the New Zealanders were in very much the same plight, "far from the old folks at home," and very conscious of that coldness of manner which so effectively conceals our warm English hearts. I remember a little later on going down to Hornchurch to address the New Zealand Convalescent Camp, which, with such a strange sense of fitness in the choice of surroundings had been pitched in that bleak and desolate piece of England. I found that those splendid boys, who had all been fighting for the Empire in many bitter conflicts, had been debating with one another whether the war had really drawn the Empire closer together. After a serious discussion they had decided that it had not. And why? Because they were going back with such sore hearts at the cold greeting which they had received from the general public in this country. That only shows how easily misunderstandings arise and how grave and deep may be the consequences.

Then, there were the Canadians and the South Africans, not to speak of the Newfoundlanders and the men from the Crown Colonies. Not so many of these were friendless in England as the men from Australia; still there was always a large proportion who were curiously and strangely unbefriended. We often forget how very hollow a great generalisation of affection may prove to be. Men are not generalisations. Devotion to the Empire is a phrase that figures in many perorations; but the individual man from the Dominions wanted to see it translated into something definite and

actual. Humanity spells itself out in individuals; it is necessary to translate our emotions into something personal. That is a thing that is forgotten by other people besides Mrs. Jellaby, and with, I fear, less excuse.

Here, for instance, was a large population of giants from Overseas who had come to our help in a great crisis which had been none of their making. The British public had the warmest feelings towards them. They meant to be kind to them, but they wanted a lead. In the absence of that lead the actual result was neglect on one side and bitterness on the other.

After all, it was a little difficult for these men from overseas to understand our ways. I remember once landing in Montreal in Canada, and before the day was out I had invitations to stay with at least half-a-dozen people and had my name put down in all the clubs in the town. There was hospitality free and easy, accepting all risks, "fearing not to sow on account of the birds"! In England you will say the thing cannot be done. We are too much the centre of this crowded world. Very well; but the thing requires explaining, and the young do not always accept your explanation.

See how it was working out. Streams of these overseas soldiers began to arrive in London on leave from the front in 1916. Good lads—splendid fighters—but young and large and eager for life—all the more, perhaps, because they lived so near to death—amazingly handsome, with the bronzed, clean-shaven faces of classic heroes—and often with their pockets full of money. What will you? Human nature hates a vacuum. Character in youth never stands still. If that tide of youth did not drift towards some pleasant shore it would inevitably crash on to the rocks. If those lads were not looked after by good people it was a sure thing that they would become the prey of ghouls.

London, in its own way, was already trying to do its best. After my talk with that Australian I wrote a letter to the *Times*. The result was an astonishing response from the best type of London Society lady. I handed those letters over to that splendid institution, the Anzac Buffet in Victoria Street, and they proved a little nucleus of day hospitality. But it soon became clear that such attentions were not enough. We were up against something bigger than could be effected by pleasant afternoon tea-parties. I do not wish to dwell on the sordid side of this matter. I will only say that in my opinion it was a disgrace to the police of London and to the War Office that so vast an organisation of financed harlotry should have been allowed to play a devilish game for so many months openly and in the light of day, wearing away the strength of Empire and the valour of those Samsons from across the sea.

Perhaps the most serious side of that fearful matter was the impression left upon the better sort of these soldiers from overseas. Remember that they were the picked men from the Dominions; and—except from Canada at a later stage—all of them came voluntarily and from the best motives. Call to mind, too, that many of them had come from little villages and towns in the Bush—away in the back country—and were new to the wickedness of great

towns. Many of us have heard the stories of these men and listened to their impressions. They speak freely to the Y.M.C.A. All I need say is that the horror, the disillusionment, the deep impression of our corruption was becoming a genuine danger to the relation of the Dominions to the Home Country.

When—to take one single instance out of thousands—a man is met at the station by a woman in a Red Cross costume, greeted with a welcome to the Homeland, and finally robbed by her of all he is worth, it takes him some time to recover again his belief in English womanhood or human goodness.

It was clear that some greater force must be brought to bear. To fight the harpies of the street, and the organised onslaught of the bookmakers, the Englishman's home must be mobilised. That old castle must open its portcullis and lower its drawbridge. That was the idea which came to a great many of us at the same time in the year 1917, and it was that common inspiration which led to the formation of the International Y.M.C.A. Hospitality League, (25, Montague Street, W.C.1). We moved from many points to that centre; but we all agreed. After all, it was not much more difficult than Columbus's discovery of how to make an egg stand up. Those lads were very far from home. Very well; let us make them at home away from home. They had come all that way to save our homes. Very well; let us share our homes with them. We all knew that they would do the same for us. Were they to go back and say that we have not done it for them? What was the good of all our Christian professions if they could go home and say: "I was a stranger, and they took me not in"!

Of course, there were hundreds of people to prove that the thing was impossible. How could a private soldier be entertained in an English middle-class house? What would the servants say? How about food? How about coal? Then there were the great multitude of the people who "begin—with—one—accord—to—make—excuse." They were on a journey. They were too poor. They were too rich. They were tired. They had married new wives. They were invalids. Their houses were too small. They were too old (at forty)—and so forth—and so forth.

Then a strange fact emerged. It was not the big houses or the rich people that came to our rescue, but the small houses and the little people—the little farms and the little shopkeepers, the mothers with large families already on their hands, the large-hearted men who remembered what it was to be young and away from home—above all the mothers who had lost their own sons. They opened their doors wide—those people who had excuses but did not make them—and our tired soldier-lads went in and were comforted.

Of course, there were joltings in the machine. The overseas men are proud. Being invited as equals, they expected to be treated as equals. The great ladies who sent the soldiers into the servants' hall found that they had mysteriously vanished; and they would appear next day at Montague Street shaking their heads and asking with their slow drawl "Did you say this was a free people?" Then there was trouble about differing social habits. There was the Australian "digger" who went to a big country

house and drank out of the "finger bowls." The hostess wrote to us on a note of pathos. She had had one nervous breakdown; if this thing went on she might have another. We encouraged her to hold on. There were worse ways of slaking one's thirst.

Or there was that other "digger" who, having emptied all the wine glasses set before him, turned round to see what was "doing" next. Let me quote his words: "So a butler with a face as long as the Day of Judgment says to me, 'Is there anything else you desire, sir?' And I rounded on him and said, as clear as I speak now, 'I want a mug of beer.'"

Or there was the stalwart New Zealander who arrived at the house of one of the best of our hostesses—a Bishop's widow with many other cares—without a scrap of luggage to his name. "Not even a sponge," as she wrote to us.

All these experiences taught us something. We learnt the amazing irresponsibility of youth straight from the trenches. They would disappear in mysterious ways—these lads. There were the two men who travelled down to Cardiff, where a splendid welcome awaited them, looked at the town, did not like it, slipped into a train returning to London, and were back on our hands next day—an unmerited slur on Cardiff, which has proved only second to Birmingham in this form of hospitality.

But these few were exceptional. As a rule, hostesses and guests got on swimmingly. The men proved easy and popular guests. They were mostly "handy" boys, ready to help with odd jobs. They did not notice the absence of servants, for they came from lands where servants are almost unknown. They brought emergency rations; they loved talking. One thing they wanted least was "entertaining." They had had enough of that in the camps. After a long afternoon with Mrs. Barnett, in the Garden Suburb, a party of Australians said to her solemnly, "One thing we thank you for, madam, you have not 'entertained' us!"

There was one very cheerful feature about the movement. Hostesses who once began taking guests went on. Some were never happy without them. "Why don't you send us more?" they kept writing. "We miss them so—we have been feeling so lonely!" People found that they learned more about the Dominions from these visitors than from all the text-books. Of course, there were some bad eggs. But far more often houses that had feared devils found themselves entertaining something nearer angels unawares.

In my own house we found ourselves entertaining two splendid gentlemen with some marvellous new sense of human equality. They breakfasted in the servants' hall, dined in the parlour, and took their tea in the nursery, thus becoming popular in all quarters of the household. I wonder how many English visitors would adapt themselves so easily to a difficult social situation!

I have before me a pile of letters from British hostesses thanking us for sending these guests. "It is such a pleasure for us to have them," says one, "and, after all, it is very little that we are able to do in return for what they have done for us." That is the right-spirit. "I have never heard a rude or rough word said by any of

them," writes another, "and they have always behaved as gentlemen." That letter comes from a lady who has entertained a great many of these men during the last two years, and has kept up a regular correspondence with her guests ever since. In many cases these men have brought real joy and happiness to desolate English homes. English mothers who have lost their own sons have found a real consolation in looking after the sons of other mothers, anxious and care-worn far across the seas. It is wonderful how often the letters express this feeling. "Many of their letters," says one hostess—a farmer's wife in Essex, "I shall always keep—in fact, I would not exchange some of them for Treasury notes."

In the course of sixteen months the International Hospitality League has been the cause of entertaining some 30,000 overseas soldiers on leave in nearly a thousand British homes; and it would be difficult to say how much that has meant in the relations of Empire. These men are the youngsters of the Dominions; they are the future generation; they will go back with a new authority of opinion from their doings in the war; and they will never forget what happens to them during this time of stress and suffering. It will stand out in letters of gold all the rest of their lives. I remember the change produced in the mind of one overseas man who, after a time in a Salisbury Plain Camp, away from all the amenities of life, had come to the very worst conclusions about this country. "Yours is a rotten people," he had said, with the bluntness of overseas speech; and he gave some good reasons for the statement. "You have only seen the rotten side," was what we said, and we sent him to a pleasant English home. He came back converted, equally enthusiastic on the other side. "You are the sweetest people in the world," was his final judgment; and it is surely a better thing that he should go back with that opinion than with the other.

There lies before me another pile of letters—the letters of the overseas guests. "If ever it comes," says one boy, "our turn to repay you in any shape or form I sincerely trust that we will not be found wanting." There you are! For, after all, kindness is almost as infectious as cruelty. Another writes to his hostess: "My appreciation of your kindness and hospitality is deep, but the quality which makes it unforgettable, the thing which colours it so beautifully is this: You, it seems, perhaps, liked me, you trusted me, you knew nothing of me, you do not now, in fact, know more, yet you were willing to take me in." They often express their pleasure in the quaint language of sincerity. "With milking the cows and helping on the farm it is really grand." "The good old English dinners and the homely comforts," writes another, "brought very much into my mind my dear old father and mother, who, as I fancy I told you before, belong to England." The friendships thus created were not confined to England. "It was through you," writes another, "that I met some of the best Irish people, and I came away with the warmest feelings for those splendid and hospitable people." But why go on? Whatever be the fault of the overseas man, at any rate he is not ungrateful, and everyone of these letters wrestles with the English language to

express the deep feelings of brave men who have been given a helping hand in the intervals of that hell which is called war.

The overseas men are now going home. But our work is not over. During the last few weeks we have been flooded with men who want to get a glimpse of our English home life before they return to their own country. It is their last chance. They will, for the most part, never see us again. They are going home rapidly now, and they will all be back before August. The very success of the movement has increased the strain, as the pleasant rumour of our English home life has gone swiftly through the ranks of the overseas armies. They really wish to see the inside of English houses, and to tread English lawns and gardens; and, above all, to play with our beautiful English children, who have so often woven new links between this Homeland and the rough men from across the ocean. The men who are coming now are those who fought and bled for us through the mighty struggles of last summer (1918). They are the survivors of many thousands who now lie beneath the grass in Flanders. They are the very pick of the Overseas Armies. Shall we close our doors on them?

Speaking in great open-air meetings to the overseas camps this last winter, both in England and in France, we ventured to risk telling the overseas men that however many desired British hospitality, there would be enough homes open to receive them. Were we too rash? Did we over-state the hospitality of the British people? Is it true—what the soldiers say—that, once the fighting stops, the civilian forgets them? Shall we be compelled to say to these boys that we cannot fulfil our word? That may mean a great deal to the future of our Empire, linked together as it is by no tie save sentiment, no claims but those of regard and affection.

For the moment, as the boys flow in, we have more guests than homes. We have to keep them waiting. But I do not believe that that will last. I feel convinced that the need only requires to be known.

For it is one of those movements that are only in their infancy. It will not end with the end of the war. I see in my mind's eye a free and British "Home from Home" League, to which membership will simply mean: "I opened my door to your son, you will open yours to mine." No idea has proved more popular in the camps. For the overseas men possess that noble type of pride which desires to return a kindness. The British Empire may in the coming time lose some of the pomp of war; but it will have a new and dearer meaning to its humblest citizens if its name is linked with the idea of Home. For it may be that in the coming time some of our own boys, homeless far away across the seas, will be grateful to the parents who opened their doors to homesick overseas soldiers to-day.

HAROLD SPENDER,

Hon. Field Sec. to the International Y.M.C.A. Hospitality League,
25, Montague Street, W.C.1.

HOPES OF BETTER HOUSING.

IT is impossible to read without a sigh the various Reports of Committees and Sub-Committees upon Housing. "Why," one inevitably asks oneself, "was not all this done earlier?" Everybody knew, at least three years ago, that even if one British soldier out of every two engaged in the war were to be killed there would still be not enough houses to go round. Many people were equally well aware that great numbers of British architects were unemployed. But, as usual, the Government lacked intelligent forethought—that greatest instrument of economy. The Housing (Building Construction) Committee was not appointed by the President of the Local Government Board until late in July, 1917, and the business committed to it was so extensive that no reasonable person could have complained if its performance had occupied a couple of years. But, by division of labour, by meeting a hundred times, examining seventy-eight witnesses and consulting sixty-one other persons upon particular points, the ten gentlemen of the Committee, and their secretary, succeeded in issuing, on the 24th of October, 1918, a Report marked throughout its ninety-seven pages by experience, good sense and large understanding. To readers familiar with the work of Professor Patrick Geddes it will almost be enough to say that his spirit pervades it.

At some date which does not appear, the Ministry of Reconstruction's Advisory Council—perhaps remarking that the Building Construction Committee, although it dealt with the planning and building of houses, included no woman—appointed a Housing Sub-Committee of women who issued, in May, 1918, an interim, and in January, 1919, a final Report. It is interesting to note how closely the conclusions of these two bodies, one composed wholly of men, the other wholly of women, are in agreement.

There seems no reason why these admirable Reports should not have been prepared a twelvemonth sooner, why, on the day when the armistice was signed, great spaces of land should not have been already surveyed and marked out for roads, nor why plans and specifications should not have been lying ready in stacks of thousands. Now, not at the eleventh, but rather at the thirteenth or fourteenth hour, nearly all the practical work of building remains to do; thousands of citizens can find no decent houses to live in; and humane people are compelled to rejoice, in the interests of the unborn, that the birth-rate is so sharply declining.

But, looking beyond the depressing present, these Reports offer us for the future a "sober certainty" of better days. They go at once to the root of the matter, and point out that there must be co-ordination and guidance. "The housing problem cannot be adequately dealt with, unless the Housing Departments of Local Government Boards are able to bring within their purview the entire housing demands of the community, and are vested with powers that will enable them to supervise and co-ordinate the housing work both of local authorities and of private enterprise. A complete survey of the housing requirements of the country should be taken, and periodically revised." At the

same time local industry should be encouraged: "The building of working-class houses should be undertaken by the smaller builders employing local men"; and "the fuller use of local materials in building" is recommended "so as to reduce the expense of transit, and to harmonise cottage building with its surroundings." In choosing a site, cheap land, if inconveniently situated, may not, it is pointed out, prove cheap in the long run: "A small average number of empty houses per annum due to a faulty selection of site will soon eliminate any financial advantage supposed to be gained by the lower cost of land." The site having been chosen, "the greatest economy in lay-out will depend on full advantage being taken of all the opportunities which the site affords. It is not enough merely to cover the ground with streets and houses. The site should be considered as the future location of a community mostly engaged in industrial pursuits, having many needs in addition to that of house-room. Their social, educational, recreational and other requirements should, therefore, be considered, and, when not already adequately provided for on the surrounding areas, should be met as part of the lay-out of the scheme." "The care and thought which are required to secure economical provision for the practical requirements, if exercised with trained imagination, may at the same time make of the necessary parts of the plan a coherent design, grouped round some central idea and preserving any existing views and features of interest or beauty." Explanations follow about economy in roads, and the desirability of grouping houses in short side roads, which need not be "made up" in the costly method necessary for main thoroughfares, and of which the actual roadway—though not the distance between the houses—may be comparatively narrow, if a wider space is allowed at the end for turning a vehicle. Houses upon such side-tracks are naturally far quieter and freer from dust, as well as cheaper to build than those upon highways; and many a little *cul-de-sac* of this pattern, generally with grass borders to its modest roadway, may be seen in garden suburbs.

Sites and contours, lay-outs, roads and drainage having been considered, the actual planning of the houses comes under review, and the Women's Sub-Committee enters the field. At this point I find my own experience diverge from the opinions expressed in both Reports. They appear to me—as does Mr. Richard Reiss, in his handy little book, "The Home I Want"—to have overlooked some of the advantages offered by cottage-flats. Several witnesses before the Building Construction Committee, however, are reported to have "expressed opinions in favour of double-flatted houses or two-storey tenement dwellings"; and Mrs. G. S. Guy appends to the Interim Report of the Women's Sub-Committee a note that "in my judgment the well-built and well-arranged modern cottage-flat is going to solve the problem of healthy housing for a large proportion of the working people who are not able to afford the rent of a good modern self-contained cottage. In my judgment, cottage-flats can be made both healthy and convenient for less money than a self-contained cottage, and must therefore have a reasonably prevalent place in

any large housing scheme." There are, moreover, other reasons, besides cheapness, why working mothers should—and, indeed, have told me that they do—prefer a flat in a two-storey building to a two-storey cottage. These are, briefly, because so much fatigue is saved by having no stairs within the dwelling; because it is easier to supervise the children; because illness is so much easier to nurse and bedrooms are so much less chilly when they are upon the same level as the kitchen fire; finally, and especially, because a sister or mother of either husband or wife so often inhabits the second flat. People accustomed to keep servants can hardly imagine the convenience to a woman who is all day long the only adult in her house of having another woman on the spot who, while she herself "goes to shop," will keep an eye on her sleeping infant and receive the milkman, rent-collector, or sewing-machine agent; and the woman who stays at home is equally glad to get her reel of cotton or rasher of bacon added to the shopper's list of purchases. Such little services working women are seldom willing to ask of neighbours unrelated to them; nor will they discuss small family affairs—which they would often find much relief in being able to discuss—with any person outside the family circle. To have a relative under the same roof but not within the abode is the ideal arrangement; and I earnestly hope that urban and suburban authorities will follow Mrs. Guy's advice and give to cottage-flats—of course with gardens to each—"a reasonably prevalent place" in their schemes.

Upon two points of planning the Women's Sub-Committee are emphatic: "(1) That complete privacy should be secured by a separate bathroom. (2) That a waste pipe and an adequate but simple system of hot and cold water supply should be provided." To middle class readers it may appear almost incredible that any builder should instal a fixed bath that has to be filled and baled out by hand (although the great majority of coppers in their own houses have to be), and for which every drop of hot water has to be heated over a fire; but such baths exist and are not even very uncommon. Another tiresome device is the fixing of the family bath, sometimes without any partition, in the scullery which is also the family cooking place—and pretty often the only passage way to the coal store and larder, as well. To these facts, no doubt, is due the current legend that working people do not use baths when provided. As the Building Construction Committee truly observe: "The housewife does not want members of the family washing in the scullery when she is busy preparing breakfast; her desire is for a separate bathroom, preferably upstairs, containing a lavatory basin and fitted with a constant supply of hot water. In this desire she is supported by medical opinion, which attaches great importance to a constant supply of warm water and good washing facilities."

The provision of hot water from a common centre is considered by both groups, and both think it desirable; the architects are the more cautious, while the women perceive more clearly the extravagance of the individualist plan, since "almost as much fuel is

required to provide two gallons of really hot water as to provide twenty."

The labour and discomfort of washing at home are recognised, and the "bag-wash" system in which as many articles as can be stuffed into a standardised bag are washed, but not ironed, at a very moderate fixed price, is tentatively recommended. One could wish that the Women's Sub-Committee had personally tested the existing bag-wash and reported whether the contents of each bag returned (a) in their full number and proper identities; (b) undamaged. Housewives are but too well aware that during the past two years their textile possessions have habitually been not merely damaged but actually demolished at the laundries. If the bag-wash were to treat any working woman's sheets as mine have been treated she would assuredly refuse its further ministrations and continue to wash her sheets herself, whether with or without a copper and hot water supply.

All parties are agreed in recommending the provision of a parlour, in addition to the general living room, and of a scullery in which cooking and housework can be carried on. "In view," says the Building Construction Committee, "of the higher standard of accommodation likely to be demanded, and having regard to the fact that well-built houses may last far beyond the building loan period of sixty years, we are convinced that the provision of a parlour will, in the long run, prove to be conducive to economy." "Where a parlour is lacking," says the Interim Report of the Sub-Committee, "we note a tendency to use the scullery as a living-room. Our attention has been called to a case where a large number of newly-built houses had to be remodelled at considerable expense to meet a demand for the additional room." Many sound reasons are given for the desirability of a second sitting-room, but there is one—perhaps the most important—which is omitted: the parlour is wanted as a place for courting. Young people must and will hold, somewhere, those endless talks which pave the way to marriage, and there can be no better place than their own homes; but a living room full of younger brothers and sisters and their contemporary friends will not serve the purpose at all. Failing a parlour, lovers have to resort to a cinema where the eternal conversation is carried on uncomfortably in a whisper.

Space forbids the enumeration of all the improvements in the plan suggested; but one general remark of the Building Construction Committee is too valuable to be omitted: "The importance of providing for all the main articles of furniture when planning a building should not be overlooked. Many recesses have been built too small to receive a piano, bed, or dressing-table, for lack of attention to this point, and when plans are under consideration or submitted for approval it is most desirable that the position of the main articles of furniture should be shown to scale on the plan." Especially is it desirable to mark the place of the bed in any bedroom plan so that any flagrant inconvenience may at once be seen. The Report itself admits a plan (p. 45) in which the end of the bed runs across a window on one side, and across the fireplace on the other, while the foot of it faces the door. Judging

from measurements with a divided ruler, the width of the path between the bed and the window-wall can hardly exceed twelve inches, while the space between it and the hearth is still narrower. Beyond the hearth, practically shut in by the bed, lies about a third of the whole available floor space. As it stands the bedroom can never be comfortable nor properly furnished, and it is difficult to see where, when the furniture is added, the occupant will be able to place himself while he dresses.

The inward-opening casement, the easiest of all windows to clean, does not seem to be anywhere mentioned; but the Committee speak of a sash window, known as "the Yorkshire slide" in which the lights move sideways instead of up and down; and the Sub-Committee of: "a newly invented 'safety sash,'" in which "the sashes are made to open inwards for cleaning as well as to run up and down." Either pattern should be comparatively easy to clean.

Experiments with compositions for floors are still being made; but nothing seems yet available which can be warranted cheap, clean, warm, and moderately silent. The floor problem is not yet solved.

A small but excellent suggestion is that the provision of brackets for curtain poles as well as of picture rails would probably prove economical.

Neither Report insists, in set terms, upon the abolition of mouldings from which dust is difficult to dislodge. To ask for curved edges and corners is good; but plain instead of corrugated borders to door-panels and window frames should be asked for, too, and the substitution of plain for patterned chimney-pieces.

The question of communal arrangements is considered at some length in the Report of the Women's Sub-Committee. They do not think it "probable that communal kitchens in which women could come in and cook for themselves will ever find favour," and the rapid decline of custom at the ordinary public kitchen clearly indicates that the fetching of cooked food is regarded only as a preferable alternative to "lining up." The Sub-Committee have "little doubt that the solution of the more difficult domestic problems will be found along the lines of co-operation rather than in isolated effort"; but do not, as, holding this belief, they well might have done, suggest to middle-class women—who are much more able than working women to undertake such experiments—the desirability of attempting co-operative enterprises.

The most exhilarating portion of the whole set of documents is Section 65 of the Sub-Committee's Final Report, which deals with the "social and educational development" of rural life and roundly urges: "that a normal minimum of village equipment should include" no less than eleven activities, mostly in close connection with the school and to be used partly in "continuation work," and partly by the inhabitants in general: (1) A group of workshops; (2) a system of gardens; (3) lectures; (4) shower baths; (5) a village hall—for plays and meetings; (6) a room fitted as a gymnasium; (7) a reading room—in connection with the country town library; (8) the use of school-rooms "for

meetings of clubs, societies and associations"; (9) adjoining the school a *café* with garden where light refreshments can be had and where the village band should play and dancing be held at least one evening a week in the summer; (10) additional instruction, under a County Council's scheme during the winter, as well as lectures upon general subjects; (11) a motor transit system which will enable people to share to some extent in the fuller educational and social possibilities of the market town.

With this last clause the Sub-Committee touched a question the full discussion of which was doubtless regarded as beyond the reference of either committee. Yet in any comprehensive view of rural housing the improvement of communications must hold an important place. Unfortunately, it is still true that: "the motor-car which should have been—and still may be—the peasant's emancipator, has, hitherto, but served to spoil such roadways as he had." Moreover, the pace of the car upon these roadways has been both too swift and too slow: too swift for the safety of bipeds and quadrupeds sharing the track, too slow for its own most advantageous use. Had there existed in this country any central control of traffic and highways, and had the controllers exercised (as, of course, however, they probably would not have done) intelligent foresight, motor roads would long since have been laid out and a cheap and adequate motor service might have been running regularly, for the last ten years, to the remotest districts of the country. If so, not even our obstructive land laws could have succeeded in keeping the country-side depopulated. With such an access to markets all sorts of remunerative activity would have sprung up, the level of prosperity would have risen, and private enterprise would have found the building of cottages profitable. The morning service would carry the labourer a couple of miles on his way to work, pick up some child needing instruction that his local school could not provide, and drop him at some centre where he would find a class of coevals, collected from an area of perhaps a dozen miles each way, and would accommodate miscellaneous passengers going on various errands of their own. The evening motor would bring back all these persons, dry, unfatigued, ready for a couple of hours' gardening, or reading, or social intercourse, or practice of some chosen craft, and would perhaps carry off young men and women to a dance in some other village, or the members of a Women's Institute to a conference. Both services would deliver and collect supplies and produce of all sorts, ranging from an Italian queen-bee, a packet of embroidery needles, a daily paper, or a library book, on the one hand, and from medicinal herbs, cooking apples and butter, to original carvings and lacework on the other. If country life is to be reanimated, better housing and better communication must advance hand in hand, and clearly the motor must be the chief medium of communication. But if motor traffic is to increase tenfold upon the common highway, what pedestrian will long be able to endure country life at all? And if the country-side becomes unendurable, who will inhabit the new houses that are to be erected?

CLEMENTINA BLACK.

REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES IN THE ARMY.

THE passage of the civilian manhood of Great Britain through her Army has left its mark on the world's history. New men, unversed in any of "the pride, pomp and circumstance of glorious war," and drawn from homes unfamiliar with the spirit of the services, were nevertheless found fit to uphold the country's honour on the battlefield. They are fast going back to the old civilian life. In a year or two khaki will be seldom seen in the streets of our great towns. Mills and warehouses will have claimed their own. The Army will once more be a profession. The cobbler will have returned to his last. The nation will have laid aside its arms. We want to see two lessons, that have been learnt from the Territorial and new Army soldier's experiences in the Army, adopted and applied by the State. One is a more humane enforcement of military law, which will preserve the independence of Courts-martial from illegal interference by Generals in the field, and will temper justice with mercy. The other, with which this article deals, is a more rational policy with regard to grievances, whereby every wrong may have a remedy. At present it has not.

The sections of the Army Act relating to the redress of grievances are extraordinarily inapt. They are quite inadequate to the pressing needs of to-day. Section 42 provides that if an officer cannot obtain justice from his Commanding Officer, he can apply through the Commanding Officer and the usual further channels of communication, for the transmission of his complaint to the Army Council for their examination. Section 43 provides for a soldier's right to appeal to his Captain, from his Captain to his Commanding Officer, and from his Commanding Officer to the General Officer Commanding. The mode of preferring a soldier's complaint is explained in his "small book." These are the only methods available. It was held as recently as 1898 in *Marks v. Frogley* (1898 1 Q.B. 888), that the civil courts cannot add to the remedy which is thus provided. Both Sections of the Army Act may have had their uses fifty years ago. To-day they are obsolete and worthless. Under King's Regulations (paragraph 133) the provisions of the Army Act on this point are supplemented by a rule that an adverse report must be shown to the officer concerned "who will initial the report at the place assigned for the purpose to show that he has seen it." This rule is designed to protect higher authorities against a charge of having intrigued behind a man's back. As the officer reported on has no option but to initial or sign what is shown to him, it is hard to see how he personally gains much benefit from its perusal.

On the whole, the futility of the mechanism laid down by the military code is felt more commonly by officers than by other ranks. However ill-treated an officer may feel, he will hesitate long before challenging any action which has been taken against his interests, under the present procedure. The man who demands access to the Army Council makes himself a marked man wherever he goes. Success at the expense of a higher authority is of little value, if it

means (as it probably will mean) continued service under an offended and irritated superior. Except in clear cases, the prospect of real redress is slight; for any complainant is at once "up against" the singular practice of the Army, under which every authority habitually "concurs" with the finding of every intermediate authority without personal investigation. It is not surprising that the privileges which Section 42 purports to give to officers are rarely exercised. The man who questions authority in the Army is asking for trouble. The man who fights against authority is damned. Moreover, the language of the Section does not cover the great majority of officers' grievances, which are literally with no means of redress whatever. It does not touch the adverse report, which is expressed in general terms and states opinion only, without condescending to specific particulars. If a report runs that X is, in Y's opinion, unfit for a post, X has no remedy unless he can show positive bad faith, which is normally impossible. It does not touch, again, the enormous mass of cases where an officer feels that he is unjustly superseded by another's promotion over his head. Promotion during the War has been governed usually by selection, not seniority. If, as Lord Rosebery once said, "seniority often spells senility," selection often spells caprice, if not jobbery. It is to-day as strongly entrenched against protest or criticism as seniority was in former times.

The bulk of the grievances, which have been experienced by officers in recent years, come under these two heads—(1) adverse reports, which are alleged to be unfair; (2) supersessions, whether in substantive, temporary or acting ranks and positions, which are alleged to be unjust. It is vital to impress upon the Government how prevalent are complaints on both points, and how impossible it is to have complaints heard and adjudicated upon under the law as it now stands. Here are a few cases recalled almost at random from the crowded memories of over four years' soldiering, and recorded here rather as types of common experience than as instances of abnormal hardship. The grievances themselves have in most cases long ago faded into mere memories. The men who have been wronged, have been largely Territorials of modest military ambitions. Many have since died for their country. Their vicissitudes are only related here, in order to exemplify the wide range of those Army grievances, for which the present code affords no measure of redress.

An adverse report is the expression in writing by a superior officer of an opinion unfavourable to a subordinate. It is shown to the subordinate, and passed on through the various higher grades of authority to the War Office. A Brigadier's judgment thus passes to the Divisional General, who "concurs" and passes it on to Corps headquarters, from which it travels by way of Army headquarters and the Commander-in-Chief's staff, to London. None of these officials usually possess any personal knowledge of the issues at stake. Each has to trust his subordinate, and he supports his action, unless it be obviously at fault. When in July and August, 1916, the 42nd Division was greatly exercised by its Major General's displacement of many of the senior officers of the

Territorial units under his command in Sinai—units which had proved their worth in Gallipoli—civilian protests at home were met (as they were bound to be met) by the War Office's profession of inability to interfere with the discretion of a General officer in the field. If a Commanding Officer is reported on adversely, for instance, as being "too kind-hearted to be an efficient disciplinarian," he cannot fight the point; and even if the General who condemns him is afterwards himself superseded on good grounds, reinstatement will never follow.

To show how far-reaching in its consequence an adverse report may be, the striking case of an officer with twenty-two years' unbroken and excellent service in the Regular Army, may be cited. As Quartermaster of a Battalion of the Royal Welsh Fusiliers, he was in January, 1917, adversely reported on by his temporary Commanding Officer as being a "cause of anxiety" and "not suitable for his position in a Battalion on active service." Upon the strength of this opinion and without further inquiry, he was sent home; called upon to resign his commission, and deprived of his gratuity. He made repeated attempts to obtain a Court of Inquiry into his case, or (alternatively) an interview with the Army Council. Former Commanding Officers and the local Territorial Association submitted strong testimonials in his favour, and joined in his appeals for an investigation. None, however, was granted to him, and the new rule of 18th May, 1918, enabling officers in such a position to interview a member of the Army Council, was held by the War Office to have no retrospective effect. There is no occasion to argue here whether this particular adverse report was well or ill founded. From the point of view of the public, the vice in this case is not so much the possible injustice to the officer in question (which is not, however, to be underestimated), but the failure of Military Law to give a man a fair trial.

Most officers will consider grievances arising from adverse reports to be far less numerous in their experience than are grievances arising from supersessions, which (rightly or wrongly) are believed by them to be unwarranted. In fact, in the great majority of such cases no adverse reports exist. Supersession takes place without any obvious preliminary action. It often overwhelms its victim like some strange freak of destiny. Thus in September, 1915, a Regular Army Major (with a D.S.O.) in command of a Battalion of the Lancashire Fusiliers in Gallipoli found himself suddenly superseded by a second-line Territorial Captain, sent straight out from England, with eleven months' home service to his credit. Other Battalions of this Brigade, on arriving in Egypt after the evacuation, found new Commanding Officers from home awaiting them (one of them a second-line Territorial), in place of men who had led them with a skill, which was beyond criticism, during the whole of the arduous struggle on the Peninsula.

In the winter of 1916-17, a Captain of the Essex Regiment, joining a unit on home service after being wounded at Suvla, found himself expected to serve as junior to two officers, whom he had known as his own two (Territorial) Subalterns at the beginning of the war, and who had since risen to be Majors without leaving

England. The local Brigadier justified this view as to precedence on the ground that he knew the two home service men better.

On September the 29th, 1916, an officer with the substantive rank of Second-Lieutenant, whose service during the war had been confined to Norfolk, was made temporary Lieutenant-Colonel of the Battalion, over the heads of many men of long experience at home and abroad. The only reason ever suggested for the promotion was that his ideas harmonised with those of the Brigadier responsible.

It is needless to multiply these illustrations, which have been only too familiar to every serving soldier. They have created an unnecessary gulf between the staff and the Regimental Officer. The Territorials have been special sufferers all through the War from that indiscriminating caprice, which the War Office would describe as the "power of selection." It will be recognised that the machinery for obtaining redress in Section 42 of the Army Act does not even touch the fringe of these grievances. Nor is there any consolation in the right given by paragraph 445 of King's Regulations to interview the Military Secretary. Any such interview could not influence the actual question of supersession.

It has been said above that other ranks are less prejudiced than are officers by the inadequacy of the Army Act in respect of remedying grievances. This fact is due mainly to the generally happy relationship between Regimental officers and men. Yet Section 43 needs amendment no less than Section 42, in view of two classes of wrongs, to which N.C.O.'s and men are now liable, and for which the present machinery for redress is either not available at all, or only available with great difficulty.

Cases in the first category arise where senior non-commissioned officers in a unit find themselves superseded not by the nominees of their own Commanding Officers, but by new-comers from outside, who are often imported into a unit behind the back of the Brigade and Battalion authorities. Thus a Territorial Regimental-Sergeant-Major, with an unexceptionable record has found himself twice displaced from this position in France by strangers with less experience and with no apparent claims to precedence. His Commanding Officer had no power to insist on his retention.

The second category arises where there is no real personal acquaintance between a Commanding Officer and his men. In such comparatively rare cases, want of tact, judgment and sympathy on the part of the Commanding Officer may breed a host of grievances among the men. In view of their ignorance of law, it is idle to expect such men to apply through the Commanding Officer himself to a General Officer; or to await a visit, which they have no reason to expect, of some Inspecting General, whom they do not know, in order to take advantage of a paragraph of the King's Regulations, which they have never read. These are the circumstances which have given rise to incidents like the mutiny at E——— in October, 1916. The comparatively lenient sentences inflicted upon the mutineers in this case were based upon the Court's recognition of the fact that most soldiers who are labouring under an acute sense of injustice, really know no lawful

means of obtaining redress, in spite of the information contained in the soldiers' "small book."

It is therefore urgent that there should be real and easily available remedies for all grievances in the Army. It is, of course, true that much of the present discontent can be allayed without legislation. If all men in high places were men of serene disposition and sound judgment, no more charges would be directed against the system of confidential reports, or against the practice of promoting by selection. Having regard, however, to the rigid traditions of the Army and the natural infirmities of human temper, it is now necessary so to alter the Army Act that Sections 42 and 43 may effectually meet the great needs of our time. The following additions to the present regulations are suggested. One signal advantage of the suggested changes is the shifting of the burden of proof from the accused to the accuser. Can such a reversion to ordinary British judicial principles be regarded as in any way revolutionary?

(a) Any officer who thinks himself wronged by an adverse report, or by supersession in respect of any promotion over his head, whether such promotion be substantive, temporary or acting, should have the right to complain to the Army Council, which should forthwith convene a Court of Inquiry to consider the complaint, and to report whether the report or supersession was or was not justified by the facts.

(b) A Court of Inquiry, convened to consider any such complaint, should consist of a lawyer as president, to be nominated by the Judge Advocate General, and of two military members, of whom at least one should not be senior in rank to the complainant, and (in a case where the complainant belongs to the Territorial Force) of whom at least one should belong to the Territorial Force.

(c) In all proceedings before the Court of Inquiry, the complainant should be presumed not to deserve the report or supersession complained of until the contrary be proved. The complaint would be deemed to be justified unless the justice of such report or supersession be proved to the satisfaction of the Court.

In the case of other ranks, some simpler and less formal procedure is advisable. Probably the best scheme, so far as home service is concerned, would be to attach a standing committee, with a man of legal training as president or chairman, to the War Office, and to provide for speedy appeals to such a committee from any N.C.O. or man with a grievance. Reforms drafted on these lines will greatly benefit the State. Not only will fewer men's lives be embittered by a sense of injustice, but a common source of discontent will be definitely removed from our military system. It is not suggested that superior officers should be deprived of their necessary powers. Adverse reports will not be dropped, and men adversely reported on will, of course, be under no obligation to contest the fairness of any criticism. Discipline will be unimpaired. It will, however, become impossible for any man or body of men in the Army to complain hereafter that prospects have been unfairly ruined, or that a wrong has been inflicted. It is difficult to see how any good custom in the Army would be injured

by the change. Even the principle of selection, already largely thrown over by the War Office with regard to substantive promotions since the Armistice, is retained within equitable limits. Only the injustice, which now admits of no redress, will disappear. It is important to realise how much better it will be for the nation to have its officers liberated from the constant menace of broken careers, so long as they do their work well. They will become ultimately dependent upon the considered judgment of impartial and detached men—not, as now, upon the caprice of individual superiors, consciously or unconsciously swayed in many cases by the conventions and prejudices of another age and another caste. At the same time, the responsibility of General Officers will be much greater in respect of their treatment of their juniors. In the present want of real methods of redress, a General is apt to be an autocrat. In common practice, the Regimental Officer holds his position at his General's discretion. If he acts on his own initiative, whether in relation to the administration of his own unit or to his action when sitting on any Courts-martial, he does so at his peril. This system is clearly bad, and requires reform. The amendments to the Army Act indicated above are not held out to be models of draughtsmanship. They are rather meant to be rough sign-posts, which point the way to a truer conception of those principles, by which any public service should be regulated. It is to be hoped that the present House of Commons will deal with the question promptly, and lay the foundations of a permanently contented Army. Elected under the same flaming impulse of patriotism that guided the British people through their long struggle against German militarism, it should prove equal to the task. We have broken militarism abroad. Let us now put our own house in order.

GERALD B. HURST.

RELIGION AND REALITY.

IF it were said to the Church, preach your gospel like a man of the world, it might shock the taste or the ethic of many. But it need only mean, do not preach it as a bookman or a sentimentalist. What does the expression "man of the world" carry? It suggests that one may have his own hobbies, interests, or ideals, but that he sees, holds, and pursues them with tact, *i.e.*, with a due consideration of the people or the world around him. He is not an egoist bounder, nor an idealist bore, but he fits himself to the life and society in which he moves, and especially to the affairs of life as a whole. His object in conversation is not to bear down on the company and get something off his own chest, but to speak relevantly to the remarks of his peers and so to criticise as to develop the occasion. And the suggestion is that our Gospel should acquire the moral and spiritual tact of the Kingdom of God as it pervades the great world, that we should cultivate the *savoir faire* of the society of Christ in the society of history. It means that the apostle should acquire, not the *cachet* of society, but the art of diagnosing the social age for the health and use of the Kingdom of God. The Christian gospel is *the* thing which concerns life as a whole. It regards every soul from the conscience; therefore it regards the whole soul, the universe of souls, the society eternal, the Kingdom of God. It is to be preached with moral relevance to that—as it is the statesman's tact to gauge his world, and his genius is to meet the true historic situation. The kingship of God is to be pressed on the real need of men with the statesmanship of God.

But the state of history, the condition of the world at this moment, shows that this is not the kind of gospel that has been got home. Do the pulpits preach to the actual and entire situation? Christ did—else He would not have been so hated. And to preach Redemption as a man of the world is to preach it as the Son of Man did. It is to preach it not as a palladium, nor as a sacrosanct relic, of the Church, but as the one moral power of the Eternal, the one destiny of all history, the one authority relevant to the present moral bankruptcy of civilisation. That collapse is not the *débâcle* of Christianity, but of a certain type of Christianity, in which the world has got the better of the Church from within. But if we say no more than that, we are only criticising, perhaps scolding. We have to insist in a positive way that the missing element in the Church's message, missing through sacrament or sentiment, is the historic, moral, creative element of the Kingdom of God and its righteousness as the first duty, the last reality, and the final destiny of all men and nations.

To preach salvation as a man of the world is to preach it as salvation from such destruction as is round us; but far more it is to preach it as salvation into the obedience of the Kingdom.

of God; which is in such deep and subtle command of all history that a Christian civilisation is but the unfolding of its foregone victory and consummation, either by way of glory or of judgment. That Kingdom for Christ ruled all, but it does not rule all for Christendom.

To preach in relevance to the world's need the word of Christ is to preach deliverance by a crisis more than progress by a continuity—and to preach it not as remote mystics but as moral and practical mystics. It is to preach the gospel of God's achieved Kingship in moral relevance to the chief ideal, dominant, and even dread, of the time. What is that haunting dominant and dread? It does not concern social vices as much as it concerns a Satanism respectable, unconscious, and possibly even religious. It is the worship of efficiency, prosperity, progress, force—all as natural powers, egoist powers, non-moral powers, demonic powers, which first allure us, then confuse us, then disappoint us, then terrify us, and then rend us. "It shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of Judgment than for you of decent Capernaum."

The missionaries find, as the first Christians found, that they have often to postpone the deep deliverance from sin to the near deliverance from ghostly fear. The heathen are more concerned with their demons than with their misdeeds, and Christ at first is more welcome as an exorcist than as a redeemer. So for us, paganised as we are by progress, fear has become a greater load than sin—fear of what the civilised machine might bring to the unfavoured many in the way of poverty, slavery, anarchy, or suffering. It is that that weighs on us rather than concern for a wounded God whom we cut in the street. Christ is more welcome as a social exorcist than as a moral Redeemer. Deep in the heart of many is the fear of a future of heartless force—especially fear for our life's ideal gains or dearest souls. We have the love that feareth all things for want of the fear of God. And the Saviour we turn to is one who will restore business confidence rather than the righteousness of God's Kingdom.

The growth of self-confidence in one half of mankind is dogged by the growth of self-doubt in the other. As we grow more prosperous we grow more sensitive; and as we grow more sensitive we grow more afraid of the unseen, of unseen contingencies, especially, and of our weakness before them. Will the world's problem outgrow the world's intellect? Mammon himself grows nervous, miserable, superstitious, and he betakes himself not to the invisible God but to the invisible without God, to occult powers. He is more ready to believe in God because of ghosts than because of prophets and apostles. He will not repent, he wants to compound—if not with spirits then with forces. He will exhaust all the possibilities of organisation and force even to the wrecking of a world. He *will* succeed; and God may be squared out of the booty.

Are we in a position to preach the deliverance appropriate here? Have we a gospel of Redemption made revelant to the fear. with a

moral power as efficient as evil can be? Have we a faith that can conquer the ruling dread and curb the terrorist powers? Have we the message of a foregone disempowerment of such Satans deep in our moral order of things? Have we a deliverance from these elemental and non-moral powers by the eternal moral victory of holy love at the heart of things? Can we be effective about an achieved deliverance from the moral impotence in us which gives these evil powers their chance? Has our gospel really overcome the world? It is a world terrorised by the amoral power in various forms of competitive force. Man's natural and egoist force was never so great. And the only power than can cope with it is that of the Kingdom of God—the costly omnipotence of holy love, of *holy* love—that egoism of the moral absolute which is the unity and the blessing of the world. Do we grasp, do we realise, that Kingship of God in such dimensions that we can preach it with its own mastery on the scale of a whole historic world? Or are we tackling a cosmic crisis with no more than a homely affection transferred to the Almighty? Perhaps we shall realise better through the war that we are involved with a *Kingdom* of evil, and not merely assailed by evil, sporadic and casual. And we may be the more forced for refuge to the Kingdom of God as still more real and mighty than godless empire.

But there is another side.

If we are to adjust our bearings to the whole situation we must regard not only the threatening powers in society but the promising. And an urgent and hopeful passion of the time is the passion, not for fraternity only, but for *reality*. But what do people mostly mean by that? It means everything if it means the right thing. Is it chiefly what the trenches would count real? So that the Church must be warned to recast its whole message, its Fourth Gospel, for instance, to meet such a demand? The threats to the Church if it do not stand and deliver to the world of literature and bustle are somewhat free at present; and one regrets to find so many preachers abetting them. But the Church of the Apostles may still, for all its dullness, be thought to know its own business and gospel best. Is reality then just sincerity? For many it means no more. Give us a real, sincere, straight man, they cry, a man of brotherly heart and social ardour, and he can preach what he likes. But that is too subjective, too temperamental, too fugitive, too fickle. It is mere impressionism. What is your warm sincerity to me? And can you guarantee the permanence of your sympathies and ideals? I want a reality on which both of us shall stand, and which makes us both more sincere than either nature or effort can. Some are too sincere to be real. They do not reveal, they blurt. They are frank, hurried, even blunt; but they do not bottom things; they are not subtle enough for reality, which is something very much more than either the obvious or the aggressive, something with more intimate access to the devious depths of personality.

What do we look back to as the most real experience in our life? Is it not some moral conflict? And still more, some moral victory, perhaps, in a region where wrestling Jacob is saved from himself, and Esau, good, easy man, falls. Our real God is

the power revealed by our fight for the soul's life on heights where the air is rare and searching, and the risk is great and lone.

“ O only source of all our light and life,
Whom as our truth, our strength, we see and feel;
But whom the hours of mortal moral strife
Alone aright reveal! ”

The last reality of life is its moral reality, where the soul, forced to its spiritual centre, fights for its moral life. The great site of revelation is not rational continuity but moral crisis, where we touch that which leaves us never the same again. We have taken reality lightly, and in all sincerity we have become unreal because we have taken revelation lightly—as if it were but exhibiting the truth a book could state, or the love a heart might feel. But revelation is redemption, which is a costly thing; it is no mere manifestation. It is not exhibition, it is action. It is not mere proffer, it is achievement. It is won in an agony and got home in blood. It does not show a God willing to redeem, or waiting to be gracious, but God at deadly work redeeming. It is the setting up by God (and not by a messenger of God) of His Kingdom at the crucial crisis either of the individual or of society. And in this task God spared not His Son in His blood. We are at this moment in such an hour of public revelation, when a religion based on mere manifestation of divine truths, divine ideals, or individual affections fails for lack of moral dynamic and historic power. The sky, which has been for us too much a thing brightly outspread, is covered with thick clouds, and from the throne are lightnings and thunderings and the judgments and the reality of Him whose Kingdom works through all and rules over all unto public salvation.

The last reality of the world is the righteousness of God in it and its tragedy—often obvious indeed, but mostly subtle, elusive, (not to say ironical) much to be inquired of, and to be found in the unlikeliest places, and in junctures which seem to give it the lie. It was established once for all in the insignificant cross of Christ, where he believed when every reason for belief was gone. It is the historic holiness of God as the power fundamental, and at last irresistible, in all cosmic things, as their last authority, therefore, and their final wealth and fullness. “ Holy, Holy, Holy, is the Lord God of Hosts, the fullness of the whole earth is His Glory.” That holiness is not mere purity or saintliness; it is kingship, moral kingship, the moral absolute taking slow, costly, invincible possession of its own. It carries with it the patience which is sure of its achieved reversion of the world, the portentous meekness (not without irony) which inherits the earth and has the world in fee. The Gospel is not just a message that God is love; but it is the historic act in which God's holy love is installed as omnipotent for ever among the world's powers and affairs. It is not the cheery word of a great good comrade (who might be as helpless as we are in the last tragic push against Fate) but the decisive power and action of the royal, omnipotent, absolute Master of every fate, the last victorious Reality of history, with

Whom we have for ever to do, and to Whom for ever we belong and we turn. The great triumphant reality in love, the divine thing in it, is its moral righteousness and invincible holiness. Holiness is the antiseptic in love which saves it from its own weakness. The saving passion in it is the passion of righteousness. The saving power is the power to take and to bear its own holy judgment. Its analogue is the married love which is the pillar and ground of society. Married love is love moralised, love treated as a permanent principle and not as a fleeting passion, love not instinctive but hallowed, ordered, more constant than passion and stronger than death. Love becomes the lasting reality of life only as it is thus settled in righteousness, and subdued to the moral order of society. This makes it wear by giving it a conscience to obey. So with the holiness in the love of God. The supreme love in God is the love for His holy Kingdom in souls, that love of the kingdom which ruled, at every moment and in every act, the Son of God, His Holy One—and ruled Him chiefly and crucially in His cross, ruled Him there in practical finality. As the last reality of the private soul is its moral reality at its supreme crisis so for the race. It is in the moral crisis of Christ's Cross.

The Kingdom of God is thus the last reality of a world where morality is not mere conduct but the ineluctable soul of things. It is something far more than ethical civilisation. It is the moral power, deep, immanent, and up-working to the command of all things and affairs. For the immanence of God in nature (which may lead to no more than a vitalist monism), let us say instead the immanence of the Kingdom of God in history. That is the true escape from Monism. For the supernatural let us say the super-historic, as more ethical and practical. The Kingdom has come, it is there below observation; and that is the only ground for our belief that it is always coming. It is not just going to come if we should happen to succeed with the idea of it, or to sacrifice enough for it. As behind muscle is nerve, behind nerve brain, behind brain the psychic man of thought and feeling, and behind that the life and destiny of the moral soul in a universe which is nothing if not moral—as it is really the soul that creates the body—so beneath and behind all else in the scale of creation is the moral reality of the Kingdom of God, which is His true image in humanity, at once the strong foundation of the earth and the last ferment in its greatest affairs. Nature is founded on that which overturns it, on a "New Covenant" greater than its uniformity. This profound and universal Kingdom of God and its righteousness is the marrow of the gospel (*Rom. 1-17*) and the true moral principle of all the revision of belief now so urgent.

There is no great blessing that may not become a great tyranny. The Church was among the greatest of boons, but it became a tyranny, and Luther had to break it. So with the Bible which the Reformation put in the place of the Church. It has become for many a millstone instead of a cornerstone. It needs breaking too. And we are now being delivered from the Bible for its Gospel, as the pitcher is broken to show the lamp. But even the very Gospel for which the Bible exists has become hardened and toughened

into a conventional scheme or a mere panacea, a saving device or a protective mechanism. There is a jargon of it. There is a jingle. And we must be roused to realise that the undying object and incorruptible reality interior to the very Gospel is the historic Kingdom of God, for which Christ Himself lived and died—a historic righteousness interior to the very order of Heaven, the last reality and destiny of the world, the unseen immanent City of God, with its costly peace for the soul and for the hierarchy of souls. Christ is Christ because He is this Kingdom incarnate, and His work in securing it is perfectly one with His person. The Incarnation, like every other great doctrine, must be construed not according to divine natures, but in terms of the Kingdom of God, historic, holy, and creative.

* * * * *

In this sense the war has come (*inter alia*) to hallow and exalt the love which is sentiment by the love which is righteousness and judgment. It comes to fulfil one function of that which Christ did in the tragedy of His blood and death; in love to bring forth righteousness and judgment; to moralise both love and faith not just by sacrifice but by sacrifice for God's Kingdom in man's affairs; to restore to them the solemn note of His holy majesty and saving wrath; to give us back an awed sense of the cost of God's love and the divine value of the shedding of blood for its holiness; to put the righteousness of the holy Kingdom at the heart of the homely heart. It has come to save evangelical Christianity from mere Tolstoism, and humanity from mere fraternity; to fill out the humane side of religion with the heroic; to surround the sweet note with the great chord; to add to kindness Christian virility, and to virility public dignity, and to public dignity the moral majesty of God and the solemnity of His grace. It has come to Christianise nationalism by ranging it in a greater unity and loyalty, to save it from mere racialism, to quell egoism private and public, to save idealism from the mere idealists, to put the Kingdom of God above man's culture (even his moral culture), to show that the drift of mere culture is not to avert anarchy (as Arnold hoped) but to produce it, and to reveal that the only power with final effect for the reconstruction of the race is not culture but regeneration, and not humane civilisation but a new creation in Christ, a new heart and not a new career. If a tremendous task is a high inspiration here is kindling enough for all the gospeling of the world.

The war is not the mockery of love, only of fraternity without a real royalty. It is the action of that royal righteousness which makes love God's love. It is a factor in the world's moral redemption by a holy love with a historic judgment which is the wrath of the Lamb Who taketh away the sin of the world. It is the action of the same moral necessity as made the Cross of Christ, and led the holiest Love not to spare the beloved Son, but to lay the chastisement of our peace on Him. The war, or rather our share in it, fills up something that was behind in the atoning judgment of the Cross upon the world, and explicates to its awful detail the final struggle so super-historic in the judgment there. But, of course, if that crisis was not super-historic history,

if there was no final victory and no settlement of good and not evil as the last reality there, if there was no defeat there of whatever we mean by Satan, if there was no last judgment of God, if it was but the chief martyrdom and apotheosis of Humanity's inner light, then we have religion as mere illuminism. And we come to have a type of piety bloodless in its strain and soft in its going, with a cross which is but the symbol of self-sacrifice (perhaps morally neuter) and not the act of holy and redeeming judgment—a piety poor in its cost and without finality, tentative in its effort without the guarantee of success, devoid of history, passion, or drama, and moving nerveless in the mighty matters of the race, like the resigned ghost of a Redeemer groping his way at first and otiose at last.

It is now well understood that the great problem in philosophy and theology is this—whether the ultimate foundation of value and of good can be identified with the ultimate foundation of reality for experience. To that problem there is but one kind of answer for the purpose of life. It must be religious and theological. The difficulty which makes all the practical problems is the difficulty of evil, and ultimately of moral evil. The most real thing for life, therefore, the reality for experience, is the good which best overcomes evil at last. That reality is, for the moral experience (*i.e.*, the experience of the whole man), the cross of Christ, of which all practical theology gives a moral account as the founding of the Kingdom of God. The religion that does most for that is the true religion. The solution of the mystery of evil is the miracle of Grace. It is practical and not theoretical, it is theological and not philosophic, if we must choose where, perhaps, there is not a stark alternative. Reality is action. And the last reality is that action which overcomes the world for good and all.

P. T. FORSYTH.

THREE GREAT AIR FIGHTERS.*

AS soon as D.O.R.A. is dead and paper is cheaper, aviation will establish a library of its own. Not the least interesting volumes on its shelves will be the autobiographies of the great air fighters. We await with interest the memoirs of the French and Italian pilots, whose Latin genius shines with a special brilliance in warfare which is always tactically offensive, even when it is strategically defensive. For the moment we are limited to a beggarly quarter-shelf of such biographies, recounting exclusively the experiences of British and Teutonic pilots. Several of these are posthumous, and have not been too fortunate in their editors. Nevertheless, the three volumes on which these notes are based supply us with very valuable psychological material. I shall try to show that they reveal the development and outlook of a type of pilot whom England and Germany produce in quantities; and that Captain Ball stands apart from Major Bishop and Baron von Richthofen, approximating more closely to the special Latin type.

The "Red Air Fighter" presents a distinct literary problem. It purports to be the first hand reminiscences of the formidable nobleman whose "travelling circus" of red Albatross machines destroyed so many Allied machines between November, 1916, and April, 1918. Its pages present two personalities as distinct as Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. Many passages betray an author who is a boy at heart, a sportsman in instinct, and a gentleman by nature. For example:—

"At last I was given the epaulettes. It was a glorious feeling, the finest I have ever experienced, when people called me Lieutenant."

Or again:—

"I was nearest to the enemy squadron, and attacked the man to the rear. To my greatest delight I noticed that he accepted battle, and my pleasure was increased when I discovered that his comrades deserted him. So I once more had a single fight. My opponent did not make matters easy for me. He knew the fighting business, and it was particularly awkward for me that he was a good shot. To my great regret that was quite clear."

And what could be more genial than the following comment on an English pilot whom the baron had driven down behind the German lines:—

"When he had come to the ground, I flew over him at an altitude of about 30 feet in order to ascertain whether I had killed him or not. What did the rascal do? He took his machine gun and shot holes into my machine. Afterwards Voss (another German 'ace') told me that if this had happened to him, he would have shot the aviator on the ground. As a matter of fact, I ought to have done so, for he had not surrendered."

* *The Red Air Fighter*. Manfred von Richthofen. (Aeroplane Pub. Co.)
Captain Ball, V.C. (Herbert Jenkins.)

Winged Warfare. Major W. A. Bishop, V.C. (Hodder & Stoughton.)

The genuineness of this self-revelation is proved by the traces of gradual development, universally noticeable in this type of pilot. As the perils of the great game are learnt by experience, the baron becomes a colder and more deliberate fighter; he ages rapidly, loses his boyishness, relies less on dash and more on tactics, and hardens into a calculating man-killer.

“When I have shot down an Englishman, my hunting passion is satisfied for a quarter of an hour. Therefore I do not succeed in shooting down two Englishmen in succession. Only much, much later I have overcome my instinct, and have become a butcher.”

Compare also the coolness of his tactics towards the end of his career:—

“I started shooting when I was much too far away. That was merely a trick. I meant to frighten him. He began flying in curves, and this enabled me to draw near. I tried the same manœuvre a second and a third time. Every time my foolish friend started making his curves. So I gradually edged quite close to him. Then I saw a bright flame, and my lord disappeared below.”

The above passages, like many other reminiscences in the book, can be paralleled from the memoirs of British pilots. But the puzzle is that side by side with this natural record, and interwoven with it, we find typical Machiavellian Hun propagandist stuff, written with an entire disregard for fact. For example:—

“He (an English pilot) shot with a kind of munition which ignites, so I could see his shots passing me. I felt as if I were sitting in front of a gigantic watering-pot. The sensation is not pleasant. Still, the English usually shoot with this beastly stuff, and so we must try to get accustomed to it.”

It is, of course, common knowledge that all the belligerents use incendiary bullets in air fighting, partly to assist in aiming the machine guns, partly with the hope of igniting the petrol tanks of enemy machines. The baron himself was using it daily at this period. A more refined dishonesty is traceable in the suppression of the casualties which befel his own squadron; very few are mentioned, and these are almost invariably ascribed to aerial collisions or to any other cause than British superiority. Allied pilots and aeroplanes are described in patronising or contemptuous terms. The book is framed and phrased as if Richthofen habitually shot down an Allied machine or two before breakfast, whereas his actual bag did not average more than three per month. The notes give no hint of the “head-hunting” tactics of the circus, which fought by preference well inside the German lines, revelled in a wind which made it difficult for Allied machines to recross the lines for home, avoided encounters with strong formations of our own men, and achieved its records very largely by laying ambushes for solitary planes, struggling home alone in a semi-crippled condition. I do not suggest that these methods are not fair fighting, especially for a flying corps which found itself outnumbered and outfought; but an honest description of the facts would not have made reassuring

reading in Germany. It seems certain that the German Ministry of Information subjects all war publications to the slimy trail of the professional propagandist.

Major Bishop is fortunately still alive, and has compiled his own reminiscences with very distinct literary skill. His book is far the most informing and the best written of the trio. Its sole defect is that it was plainly written up from brief contemporary notes at the end of his first prolonged spell of fighting. As the earlier chapters thus reflect the mature outlook of the veteran killer, the boyishness of his early days is partially obscured. Nevertheless, the sensations of his novitiate are still legible. On his first trip over the lines he flew the last machine in the formation, and was warned before starting that the Richthofen "head-hunters" were always alert to detach and slaughter the tailmost machine; so he says:—

"The way I clung to my companions that day reminded me of some little child hanging to its mother's skirts while crossing a crowded street. I was so intent on the clinging part that I paid very little attention to anything else."

He rapidly overcomes his initial nervousness, and begins to discover humorous aspects of his lethal occupation:—

"There was a large white German two-seater, doing artillery work, which was commonly called the 'flying pig.' It was very old, had a bad pilot, and a very poor observer. It was a point of honour that the decrepit old 'pig' should not be shot down. It was considered fair sport to frighten it. Whenever we approached, the pig would begin a series of clumsy turns and ludicrous manœuvres, and open a frightened fire from ridiculously long ranges. The observer was a very bad shot, so attacking this particular German was always regarded as a joke. One day the patrol leader made a determined dash at the 'pig' and frightened it so that it never appeared again. For months he was chided for playing such a nasty trick on a harmless old man."

Another phase of boyishness is plain in his account of his first fight:—

"Soon there was no longer any doubt as to the identity of the three aircraft—they were Huns, with big black crosses on their planes. I could hardly realise that these were real, live, hostile machines. I was fascinated, and wanted to circle about and have a good look at them."

He attacks one of them, which turns over on its back, and falls. Suspecting that this was a *ruse* to escape, young Bishop follows the Hun down:—

"I dived after him. Down he went for a full 1,000 feet, and then regained control. I had forgotten caution and everything else in my wild and overwhelming desire to destroy this thing that for the time being represented all Germany to me."

The next quotation shows that the young pilot is becoming more calculating after some months of experience, but that he is still at the mercy of his youthful impulses:—

"There was born in me a distinct dislike for all two-seated German flying machines. They always seemed so placid and sort of contented with themselves. I searched for them high and low. Many people think of the two-seater as a superior fighting machine because of its greater gun-power. But to me they always seemed fair prey and an easy target. One afternoon, soon after this Hun hatred had become part of my soul, I met a two-seater about three miles over the German lines and dived at him from a very low height. As bad luck would have it, my gun had a stoppage, and, while I turned away to right it, the enemy escaped. Much disgusted I headed away homeward, when into my delighted vision there came the familiar outlines of another Hun with two men aboard. I flew at this new enemy with great determination; but after a short battle he dived away and landed in a field underneath me. To see him calmly alight there under perfect control filled me with a towering rage. I saw red things before my eyes. I vowed an eternal vendetta against all the Hun two-seaters in the world, and, the impulse suddenly seizing me, I dived right down to within a few feet of the ground, firing a stream of bullets into the machine. I had the satisfaction of knowing that the pilot and observer must have been hit, or nearly scared to death, for, although I hovered about for quite a long time, neither of them stepped from the silent machine."

Much later in his career, when he is vainly trying to shake off a Hun scout, firmly established in the death-dealing blind spot under the tail of his own machine, a verse from the *Lobster Quadrille* occurs to him:—

" ' Won't you walk a little faster? '
 Said a whiting to a snail ;
 ' There's a porpoise close behind me,
 And he's treading on my tail. ' "

Not long afterwards he goes out alone before dawn, and attacks a Hun aerodrome, crashing three of the machines which hurriedly got up and tackled him. On the return journey he is seriously afraid of losing his reason, as the combined result of the excitement, the consequent reaction, and the exhaustion of such an enterprise in the chilly air of a cold morning. But on arriving above his own aerodrome he instantly recovers, and flies round in circles, firing off Very lights to inform his comrades of his success.

The concluding pages show how rapidly war ages the most harum-scarum young dare-devil. Major Bishop records his determination before going on leave:—

" Having got so far in the game, and past its most dangerous stages, I would take no foolish risks, but continue to wait for the best opportunities. It was very hard to restrain oneself at times."

Maturity is evident also in the following:—

" The idea of killing was, of course, always against my nature, but for two reasons I did not mind it; one, and the greater one, of course, being that it was another Hun down, and so much more good done in the war; secondly, it was paying back some of the debts I owed the Huns for robbing me of the best friends possible.

Then, too, in the air one did not altogether feel the human side of it. It was not like killing a man so much as just bringing down a bird in sport.

"In going into a fight now I felt none of those thrills which I used to feel at first. I was quite cool and collected, but probably did not enjoy it as much as I did in the days when a certain amount of anxiety and fear was felt just before the fight started. But the moment my machine gun commenced to fire, I felt the old feeling of exultation, and this always remained with me throughout the whole of every fight I have had."

Perhaps the deliberate watching of an enemy's incendiary bullets, in order to decide whether he is nervous or not, is as clear a proof of coolness as the book affords:—

"On we came, head on, both firing as fast as we could. I saw his smoking bullets streaking by about four feet above my head, and what annoyed me a bit was the fact that they were passing that spot in a well-concentrated group, showing that he had his shooting well in hand, and was quite cool. I have never fired with more care in my life . . . I was overjoyed to see his machine a mass of flames and smoke just commencing to fall."

There is very little of the eager, adventurous boy remaining; when a soldier can feel and fight like this, he has hardened into a tight-lipped dangerous man.

Allowing for the diverse conditions of the German and British flying services, it would seem that Baron von Richthofen and Major Bishop are temperamentally similar. They go into action for the first time as dare-devil boys, excited at the prospect of novel sensations, experiencing the minimum of nervousness, touched with compassion for their earliest victims. Each of them is bursting with a glorious recklessness. Each rapidly develops that characteristic callousness of the young soldier, which regards slain enemies impersonally when the eye once grows accustomed to slaughter. Both of them survive the first dangerous month, which proves fatal to so many young pilots. In each case the survival is due not to the sheer luck which every tyro must pray for, but to unusual skill in pilotage, deadly marksmanship, and a knack of lightning decision. In a very few weeks the young pilot faces experiences which either wreck his nerve or steady him, and prune the exuberance off his daring. So in a short time we watch Richthofen and Bishop maturing into men. The dangerous *abandon* of youth gives place to the far more formidable onslaughts of calculating adult confidence. It is difficult to identify more than one point in which they differed very materially when they laid down their respective pens. In Richthofen's closing days he was a "head-hunter" of the most pronounced type. He refused battle except on terms favourable to himself. He seldom fought alone. He drew off his squadron when it was outweighed. He lay in wait for weak or crippled enemies. For these unsporting tactics he incurs no personal blame. Like every soldier he took his orders from his commanders. War for the German is a business, not a game. Its procedure is governed by inexorable logic, and sportsmanship is alien to its spirit. The

business of a Richthofen, as of a Ludendorff, is to manœuvre his enemy into a position of disadvantage, and then to strike without pity. Richthofen fought according to Clausewitz. Force of circumstances is driving our own Air Force towards the same principles. In his later chapters Major Bishop betrays a similar logic. He develops an eye for "fat two-seaters." On the other hand he does not shrink from facing extreme personal risk—witness his solitary raid on the Hun aerodrome. Both men are probably typical of the best class of professional soldier-pilot, present and future.

Captain Ball, on the other hand, never grew up, and was a soldier by accident, rather than by temperament. If football phraseology were substituted for the flying terms in his letters, they would read as the work of a fifth-form boy at Rugby who had just got into the fifteen, and hoped to captain it some day. The reader must be profoundly impressed by his modesty. Towards the end he was a national idol. France shared our pride and wonder in this miraculous lad. To be the most envied member of a corps which appeals to the imagination more than any other, is strong wine for young heads. It never intoxicated Ball. He remained merry, modest, and simple, when his breast was a blaze of ribbons and he could nowhere remain incognito. Moreover, his sheer youthfulness is invincible. For fifteen months he courts death, and inflicts it many times. Many a pilot has gone out as a harumscarum schoolboy, and returned after three months to frighten his mother by his hard manhood. In Ball's case no such development is visible. On the night after he killed his fortieth German he wrote:—

"I have just been lighting the petrol stove in my bath tank. It is great sport having to heat your own water before you can have a bath, but it takes about two hours to get the water. When I am happy, I dig in the garden and sing."

He never matured into the professional slayer. On the night before his death he says:—

"Am indeed looked after by God; but oh, I do get tired of always living to kill, and am really beginning to feel like a murderer. Shall be so pleased when I have finished."

In spite of this emotional distaste for the job, he was in all probability a more dangerous opponent than either Richthofen or Bishop; and we are now in a position to dogmatise more confidently about the various types of air fighter, of which there are three at the front.

The first is compounded of sheer recklessness and *abandon*. Being young at the game he attacks with the fury of inexperience, and he often destroys salted opponents, just as the tyro with the rapier sometimes ran through the veteran duellist in olden times by sheer frenzy and dash.

The second type is composed of the survivors from the first class, grown older, rendered cunning by experience, fortified by a caution which improves tactics if it weakens dash. Every pilot who survives the first month or two can secure a place in this class, but the order of merit depends on certain qualities which the

"aces" possess in unusual degrees. Deadly marksmanship, genius in tactics, light "hands" in controlling the aeroplane, and a keen eye for scanning the air contribute to special distinction in these well-filled ranks. A certain amount of sheer good fortune is probably essential to prolonged existence even amongst these veterans. Bishop, McCudden, Richthofen, Voss, Guynemer, Nungesser, Baracca, and other renowned "aces," are all superlative examples of the type.

In the third class Captain Ball, to the best of the writer's belief, stands alone, though it is possible that when more is known, one or two of the Latin pilots—French or Italian—may claim a place beside him. Outwardly, it might seem that he never lost the reckless *abandon* of inexperienced youth. Actually, his apparent foolhardiness was distinguished by a rare and consummate genius. There was no such development in his fighting as we can trace in the record of other "aces." He was not even a particularly clever pilot. He was never at his best when fighting with companions, or in stereotyped fashion with a formation of machines. Superb gunnery was the one quality in ordinary demand which he exhibited. Nevertheless, he could go out singlehanded, and attack a group of twelve, fifteen or twenty Huns, and return unscathed with an addition of two or three crashed enemies to his bag. The secret is that he fought intuitively, whilst the other famous pilots attained their results by calculation.

Every pilot is tested at his medical examination for what is known as his "reaction period," *i.e.*, the delay between resolving to perform an action and its actual performance. The shorter this period is, the better fighter the man will be. Air fighting with machines which can travel $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles in a minute, and reverse their direction of travel in a fraction of a second, hinges on lightning decision. Ball was no meditative fighter, weighing this course against that, enquiring the meaning of this action, pondering possible plans. With him the action of brain and eye were synchronised absolutely. His guns were in action before an ordinary pilot would have decided what to do. His favourite manœuvre bears striking testimony to the extraordinary harmony between his eye, his brain, and his fingers. The ordinary single-seated fighting machine of those days carried one gun, immovably mounted on the nose of the machine, and sighted by lining up the aeroplane bodily with its target. Consequently, the stereotyped tactics consisted in attacking the enemy from above, when the dive endowed your machine with superior speed, whilst the position offered a fair chance of surprise. As the diving machine approached its victim, the gun opened fire. Ball secured many of his victims by feinting with these tactics, and steepening his dive at the last minute to pass under the enemy. He carried an additional pivoted gun on his upper plane, which he could bring to bear for a fraction of a second as his machine flashed beneath the belly of its opponent. During this microscopic tick of time Ball would sweep his fingers off his bow-gun and control-lever to the overhead gun, line its sights up, and get off a burst. To this day many ordinary pilots confess they are too slow to use the overhead gun to any advantage.

It is questionable whether a pilot of this type would improve after a certain point in his career. He fights, not by reflection, but by intuition. As he ages, the inevitable inhibitions will appear and rob his attack of its main danger, whilst such a temperament may be unable to develop the more calculating tactics. However this may be, it is consoling to know that Ball did not die because he was past his prime. He became involved in a "dog fight" against vastly superior numbers of crack German pilots—very possibly he was entrapped, and in the resulting tangle his abnormal quickness and resource could prove no real insurance against a shot from astern or from a flank. In single combat he would not have met his match until he was a few years older; and then he might have been shot down either by a younger genius of his own type, or—conceivably—by quite an ordinary pilot, for age might have undermined the very foundations of his method. So far as existing materials afford the basis for a judgment, he possessed genius of a unique type, innate rather than developed, temperamental rather than trained. His like must be sought in the air services of France and Italy, rather than in those of England and Germany, countries in which Major Bishop and Baron von Richt-hofen represent the typical super-pilot.

JOHN STEEL.

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE STAGE.

“ As to the advice to ‘ take things quietly as they are ’ we can see the result in the present terrible war, and we can thank ‘ the Divinity that shapes our ends ’ that the fine, devoted brotherhood of nations in arms . . . did not ‘ take things quietly as they are ’ ! ”—
ADELAIDE FARREN. Extract from a letter to *The Referee*, September 8th, 1918.

IN the new programme of the Progressive Party on the London County Council, which was published in the October number of the CONTEMPORARY REVIEW, Dr. Scott Lidgett included a municipal theatre for the use of the citizens of the metropolis. And since making this announcement he has spoken to the members of the London Shakespeare League on the same subject, pointing out that the suggestion forms part of a larger scheme for encouraging art generally in London, adding, however, that it must not be looked upon as in any way challenging the methods or interests of theatrical managers. But Dr. Scott Lidgett did not say whether the Progressive Party had obtained a promise of co-operation from the managers in carrying out such a scheme, nor even if an attitude of benevolent neutrality might be expected from them.

It is, indeed, doubtful if anyone unconnected with the stage has grasped how formidable is the network of financial interests overspreading the amusements of the whole of London—a network which is in the hands of those who can, if they choose, let nothing live outside its meshes. And the grip which commercialism has obtained over the English theatre is not likely to be relaxed. Managers have stated that in their industry thirty millions of money have been invested. They cannot afford, therefore, to let competitors enter the field, nor will they allow them the use of their theatrical property and machinery except on impossible terms and conditions. Is, then, Dr. Scott Lidgett prepared to meet with opposition from the theatrical industry to his proposal of a municipal theatre? Assuredly the old outcry will be raised, that to maintain a theatre out of the ratepayers' money is unnecessary, because there are now a very large number of “ well-managed playhouses ” existing in London! It must also be remembered that owners and lessees of theatres have considerable business dealings with the liquor trade and with the newspapers. As a consequence the gossip in every public-house in London could easily be “ engineered ” to defeat the proposal, while the Press, if not actively opposed to the scheme, would of necessity be apathetic or silent. The challenge, therefore, must be taken up, and all objections answered, with courage and conviction. The question of theatre reform needs to be urged with the same insistence as was shown by President Wilson, when he denounced American trusts, or not urged at all.

There is no lack of evidence to prove that for some years past London theatres have not been managed in the interests of the public. Scarcely a day passes in which some newspaper paragraph does not unconsciously betray how reckless is the gambling in plays and playhouses, and quite recently, in a daily newspaper,

under "Special Law Reports," there was published a theatrical manager's affairs in the Court of Bankruptcy. The particulars given there illustrate the use to which many of the London theatres are put, irrespective of public taste or convenience. A financier buys the copyright of a farce as a business speculation. He then rents a London theatre, paying any price for which he can get it, from £270 a week upwards, and notwithstanding heavy financial losses continues the run of the farce there for six weeks or more, hoping to dispose of the various provincial and other acting rights in the play of which he is the sole owner. But apparently the capital has given out before any sales of the acting rights have been made, so he enters the Bankruptcy Court. Now, the normal rent of a theatre in the Strand used to be about £80 a week, and the increase in price is due to the number of speculators who have come into the "industry" in order to find a fortune-making play. Again, to exploit a play successfully, a London theatre is needed so as to ensure not only a London reputation, but that the owners of the play may be in immediate touch with the agents who negotiate for acting rights in all parts of the English-speaking world. The wild speculation which goes on over the "engineering" of a play, in order to make it a valuable money property, has the further drawback that the plays themselves are without a particle of artistic or dramatic merit.

For the capitalists, who are mostly business men on the Stock Exchange, finance anything that is crude and commonplace, or ridiculously sentimental or sensational, being shrewd enough to realise that good plays are not wanted since they need good actors to interpret them, and intelligent audiences to enjoy them. For this very reason they will have nothing to do with the plays of the better class of dramatists so long as money can be made by persuading the indiscriminating that the inanities which are provided for them are amusing, and, above all other considerations, "what the public wants." Thus the choice of a play is not an affair of moment with speculators. What they consider carefully is the amount of capital needed to keep a play running at a London theatre, at a *loss*, until it can be advertised into a financial success as a "screaming comicality" which everyone should go and see. Unfortunately, the appeal, when reiterated on hoardings and in newspapers, day by day for months together, is irresistible, and people begin to flock to the theatre. The unthinking portion of the community has become, in fact, hypnotised by advertisements and newspaper paragraphs, which, it is not an exaggeration to say, are misleading or untrue. Such a play as described above is not new or original, it is not even amusing; the regular playgoers, who visit every new piece produced in London, have come away disappointed, if not disgusted, at the consciousness that once again they have been victimised. So far as the opinion of "first-nighters" is concerned the piece is a dismal failure, and for the first seven or eight weeks the only spectators to be found in the house are those who have not paid for their seats. Meanwhile the advertising agent is busily at work, and the paragraphing and "booming" now begin, with the result that in about three months' time from the date of

production the house is full night after night without the help of the free list. As the vast audience leaves the theatre there is a look of bewilderment upon all the faces, as if the thought in the mind of each individual was "What has brought all London to see this nonsense?" Then the mind harks back to a second thought, "But it was praised in the newspapers so it must be amusing"!

The Press may contend that theatrical paragraphs, which the public finds in newspapers, are legitimate "news." But when, after the production of a new revue, people read in the papers that during the first week the advance booking has amounted to £14,000, they receive something more than "news." The manager, who, we presume, has given the editor this piece of information, must know that it is a suggestion to the public that all London is bent upon seeing the revue, and that the readers of the paragraph will infer that they had better lose no time in securing their tickets! It may be doubted if the editor sent to the theatre to ascertain whether the amount stated was correct. Is such a question ever asked?

Another instance of partiality can be quoted. In this case news prejudicial to the interest of the theatrical industry is withheld from publication in the newspapers. A libel action was brought by Mr. Oswald Stoll and the Alhambra Company, Limited, against General Sir H. Smith-Dorrien. The General on his part, as he himself has stated, was anxious that the case should be brought into Court "that he might have an opportunity of vindicating his criticisms before a jury." But he was willing to agree to the record of the action being withdrawn provided his good faith in the matter was clearly recognised, and his costs defrayed. This was agreed to in the Court, the Judge adding these significant words: "It is perfectly obvious from the terms of what has been read that a reform has been brought about in a place of entertainment, and apparently by reason of the attention he (the General) drew to the matter." This, of course, was an admission on the part of the Judge that the General was justified in using the words he did. The costs demanded were paid. Yet these particulars of the settlement, although the case had excited widespread interest, were kept back by editors of the principal London newspapers.

So far, then, it can be assumed that neither the theatrical managers nor even the Press can be said to encourage or protect the art of the theatre. And, unfortunately, there is a third influence connected with the stage which is equally unsympathetic towards the better class of drama. Owners of theatres are strictly men of business, and every available part of their buildings is made to pay. The walls of the corridors and approaches to the boxes are let to display some firm's engravings. The act-drop is used for the advertisements of tradesmen, so are the programmes. The latter, together with the cloak-room fees and the refreshment bars, are usually let to someone in the wine or catering business, who pays rent of any sum from £10 to £40 a week, according to the class of theatre.* The

* "I have always set my face against any company with which I am associated sub-letting this concession (the bars), as I think the considerable profits derived from this source should be part of the income of the theatre."—*Sir Alfred Butt, in the Report of Drury Lane Meeting, April 1st, 1919.*

names of the articles advertised suggest the sort of audience the lessee of the "bars" expects to be present; wine and beer, cigarettes and cigars, ladies' furs and underclothing, opera-glasses, and up-to-date furniture on the hire system. It is not difficult to realise that the needs of these caterers and of their staff of assistants do not lie in the direction of serious drama.

It must also be remembered that the modern play affords no scope for the actor's art, and its method of presentation is looked upon by artists as mere wage-earning drudgery. Except for the salary and some display of personality there is nothing mentally satisfying in playing a thankless part for one hundred or more nights. So the energies of the actor are absorbed elsewhere. For instance, in a Sunday paper a well-known artist gives his readers advice on how to become a comedian. He relates how he started his theatrical career as an acrobat, and adds: "A well-managed tumble helps a joke along wonderfully." Then he took up engineering, and there can be no question, he thinks, that much of whatever success he attained on the stage was due to "engineering." He believes in a comedian possessing a striking personality, "one that makes you readily recognisable." Nor must an actor allow himself to be unduly "inflated"! That, he maintains, is the "proper attitude." Another important requisite he names is "affability," because "you must not put side on" but allow yourself to be called "Billy"! And the reader wonders what all this has to do with the art of comedy. The information is only a little less startling and incongruous than the announcement in the "Palestine News" that "The Sparklets" have appeared at Jerusalem, and that the "show" took place at "The Oliveum," a fit-up on the Mount of Olives! What can be more unfortunate for a people than that the manufacturers of its amusements should deliberately exclude the work of the artist and of the genius? So brains and energy, which should be devoted to delighting the eye and the ear of the public, are exhausted in perpetuating trivialities and vulgarities which are of no account in themselves, and that are but a poor compliment to the intelligence of the community on which they are inflicted. Thirteen years ago Dr. Horton visited the Empire Music Hall for the purpose of investigation, and then wrote the following words:—

"It was deplorable that human beings should find pleasure in things so banal, brainless, and insipid. . . . These London entertainments were not deliberately vicious. They did not excite dangerous passions. Their faults were negative rather than positive. For them the public was not composed of beings with intelligence, good feeling, and a certain measure of idealism. The programme excited curiosity, wonder, and occasionally mirth; but it never ventured to play on the nobler side of men, or to give them that genuine joy which comes when they are lifted above themselves and incited to a finer and more exalted ambition."

Mr. Dennis Eadie regrets the disappearance of the actor-manager and thinks that the present unsatisfactory state of the theatre is due mainly to the increasing number of the syndicates. But the opportunity of saving the drama was lost during the conflict with the music-halls, when actor-managers failed to protect the interests of

their art, and sanctioned the amalgamation of variety with drama in the same theatre. The emoluments, however, offered by the syndicates for actor-managers to appear in the halls in "potted-plays," proved too tempting to be declined, and the injury thus done to the stage was serious. Mr. E. A. Baughan, in summing up the achievements of the theatrical year for 1917 in "The Stage Year Book," had nothing better to report than that "the output of new plays has been, indeed, far below the average in quality as well as in quantity." In fact, for the last decade the reports in each year's book show how, and why, the quality of dramatic work has been gradually deteriorating. This deterioration would never have taken place if the aims of our actor-managers in the past had been less individualistic and more public-spirited.

Again, an actor-manager's choice of plays is opposed to all notions of dramatic art when his object is merely to exploit himself. Also it must be remembered that in London, with a population of thirteen millions to draw from, a number of theatres can thrive by catering for one class of audience—a class whose taste has become used to the kind of entertainment set before it. So that managers often find that they are obliged to continue the trivial productions which they have taught their public to like. After all, is it not a matter of moment for the State to consider if our theatres are merely to exist for the purpose of encouraging stupidity? As Carlyle once said: "To impart the gift of thinking to those who cannot think—and yet who would if they could—this, one would imagine, was the first function a Government should discharge."

However, there is no chance of the Government taking up the question of theatre reconstruction; its hands are full, and since the theatres have contributed large sums of money for the war, not only through taxation but also through the box-office at special performances given in aid of Red Cross funds, Government intervention is improbable. Yet half the evils connected with the present system would disappear if speculators were not allowed to obtain the monopoly of a play. Acting-rights should be reserved for the theatre where the play is produced, and not be negotiable for every theatre in and out of the United Kingdom by the manager who has first produced that play. At the conclusion of its first "run" a play should again become the property of its author. In this way the inducement to gamble with plays would be removed; rents of theatres would again become normal; and the public would gain in the number and variety of pieces, old and modern, which would be produced.

Meanwhile theatrical managers, under the exhilarating influence of war-time prosperity, are not amenable to any arguments for improving the theatre, and the work of our best dramatists and actors remains at a discount.

WILLIAM POEL.

THE FUTURE OF PORTUGAL.

THE present times are not favourable to vague sentiment or the airing of personal predilections. They require clear thinking and plain speaking if anything good is to come out of the dreadful muddle of Portuguese politics, and Portugal's future is to be something more than a series of fruitless revolutions. For the present one must set the Royalist cause absolutely on one side, and in their own interests, as well as in the interests of Portugal, the Royalists will be well advised to abstain from attacking the Republic during the next five years. It is essential that the Republicans should become convinced that public opinion in Europe would be content with a moderate conservative Republic, and that moderate Republicans are not traitors to the Republic, but the best guarantees of its continued existence. Hitherto the Jacobins have been perfectly unwilling and unable to believe this, or that the hostility, when there has been hostility in Europe, has been directed not against the Republic as such, but against a narrowly Jacobin Republic. Yet until they do so they will no doubt continue to impose a one-party system, and to drive their opponents into the ranks of the Royalists.

The real effort to institute a conservative Republican party was made not by the so-called moderate Republican groups but by the late President Sidonio Paes. He was denounced by the Democrats as playing into the hands of the Royalists. That they were wrong is proved by the fact that the Royalists, who may have hoped at one time to find in Paes a cat's-paw or General Monk, had begun to recognise before his death that he was likely to prove the most serious obstacle to the Restoration. So much so, indeed, that the Democrats, who sometimes glory in his murder as that of a fool and a tyrant, say, alternatively, that it was the Royalists who murdered him. His death deprived Portugal of a chance of ordered progress and reconciliation which is scarcely likely to return. His memory remains as one of the noblest in the annals of Portuguese history.

After his death there were really only two solutions for Portuguese politics: the destruction of the Monarchy or the return of the Democrats. The Evolutionist and Unionist parties have been moderate only in name, and have never possessed any real power. They have constantly knuckled under to the stronger Democrat party, which has always maintained a policy of no compromise, and under a strictly constitutional tyranny, but still a tyranny, pursued its anti-clerical way, while it has never distinguished very definitely between its political opponents and criminals. All its opponents are criminals. It is this Jacobin frame of mind which in the past has brought such evil days on the Republic. Opposition, driven from legitimate channels of expression, has become subterranean conspiracy, with the result that the Jacobins, a very small minority, have become even narrower and more suspicious, and ever more inclined to consider themselves the only true defenders of the Republic.

At the same time these men, who are now once more in power, clearly recognise that the Republic during the first seven years of its existence (1910-1917) was not a complete success, and they now wish to begin all over again, to return to October, 1910. Public opinion, which asks them to be tolerant and generous, should begin by being generous towards them. This requires some generosity, considering their past record. But since they profess to be working for the regeneration of Portugal, and aspire to set her administration and finance in order, let public opinion give these politicians a free hand. Long before the five years are out, if one may be permitted to prophesy, the Republicans will be at one another's throats and Lisbon once more have become notorious as usurping Barcelona's right to be known as the city of bombs. If you put fire into the hands of a child, or arms into the hands of the first-comer, you must expect trouble.

At present there is no opposition whatever to the Republican party in power. The Royalists have been routed, the Army humiliated, the police disarmed. The new Parliament will be elected and the new Government will be appointed by this party. But that only places it in an extremely responsible and highly dangerous situation, and its only way of securing its position is by showing sufficient forbearance towards its opponents for a conservative Republican party to gain real strength. That is, however, precisely what one may suspect it cannot do, or not for long, the hands of the nominal authorities, inclined to moderation, being tied by the demands of their extremist supporters.

In return for giving this party a free hand, public opinion expects that it should be tolerant towards the Church, maintaining the relations between Portugal and the Vatican renewed by President Paes, not persecuting the priests, who very naturally adhered to the Monarchy once it had been proclaimed in the north, and not making religious education a crime. Secondly, it expects that discipline and public order shall be maintained, and that Lisbon be not converted into a scene of continual anarchist outrages. It was one of the great services rendered to Portugal by the late President Paes that he instituted an efficient police, and during his year of office bomb outrages at Lisbon had become a thing of the past. Will that continue? It is much more difficult for this to be achieved by a party which has undermined the authority of the police by giving the real power to armed civilians or carbonarios, and for years raised no protest against political assassination. The murderers of President Paes and of Captain Jorge Camacho are now in prison, and at the present moment it appears doubtful whether they will become national heroes or receive a sentence of three or four years' imprisonment. Yet so long as such crimes go unpunished, so long in fact as capital punishment is not restored, while hundreds of innocent men are kept for weeks and months without any formal accusation in perfectly insanitary prisons, there can be no hope of a renewal of discipline, and one must look for more murders to come.

This brings us to a further demand on the part of public opinion: that the Republic, in its new phase, should show its generosity by

releasing all but a few ringleaders among the many thousands of persons arrested. These are the conditions necessary for the real pacification of the country. Its inhabitants have undergone so long a period of upheaval that, if their personal liberty and their religious convictions were respected, they would be content to live quietly under a tolerant Republic. It is for this reason that we will not dwell on the deplorable events of the last weeks, and would plead that the Republicans, Extremists, Jacobins, Democrats, or whatever they are—we have had far too much of labels—should be given a fair chance to show what they are capable of doing in the interests of Portugal. It is probable that they would prefer to have the esteem of public opinion in Europe rather than face its contempt, and in this respect they will have to remember that so long as the series of ministries passes in a cinematographic rapidity, opinion in Europe, not to speak of America, will necessarily regard the game of politics in Portugal with more scorn or amusement than respect.

There is a further point. Some of the men who are now returning to power in Portugal are men who have leagued themselves in the past with those Spaniards who are working to throw Spain into a state of Russian chaos. Public opinion in Great Britain will *never* support the Bolsheviks in Spain nor their friends, and it is just as well that the Portuguese Democrats should realise that if they wish to have the regard of Englishmen they must give up all underhand dealings with Spanish revolutionaries. Being victorious, they are within their rights if they place their own friends in power in Portugal, and it will be well if there is less hedging and subterfuge than in the past. It should surely not be difficult for officers and civil servants to decide, and, having decided, to state openly whether they are in favour of: (1) the Monarchy, (2) a moderate Conservative Republic, or (3) the radical Republic.

Writing as one whose love for Republics in general is small, and whose love for the Portuguese Republican Democrat party in particular is really almost imperceptible, I may be allowed to insist on the wisdom of placing no difficulties in the path of Portugal's present rulers. They claim that they can improve Portugal's position, and it certainly has some need of improvement. Well, let them do so. We give them five years. We shall see what we shall see. Either they will succeed in modifying their past attitude of intolerance, checking the unseemly ardour of the "defenders of the Republic," reconciling an appreciable number of Portuguese, and so establishing a stable Government, and in that case Portugal will be the gainer; or they will go on in their old courses, and in that case they will be a diminishing heap and their reign will not be of long duration. They have their destiny in their own hands. But if they are on their trial, so in a sense are the critics and foreign observers, for they have to show that they do not object to the Democrats as Democrats, but will welcome honest administrators, tolerant statesmen and stable ministries wherever they are privileged to find them. Give us good sherry—or perhaps in the present wave of abstention one should say lemonade—and never mind about the label on the bottle. Give us a firm and conciliatory Government, and call yourselves what you will; the opposition of all friends of

Portugal will melt away like frost in the sun. Of Democrats who bring peace, confidence, toleration, hard work, careful administration and the development of trade in their train, one can only say, as President Abraham Lincoln of General Grant : Give us more of such Democrats.

AUBREY F. E. BELL.

LEGAL UNITY AND LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH.

AT the last meeting of the American Bar Association, Professor Cammeo, of the University of Bologna, who had been sent by the Italian Government, delivered an address upon the present value of comparative jurisprudence. The ordinary individual is repelled by the title of the subject and cannot conceive that it is one in which he has any personal interest. But, in fact, the number increases every day of those to whom the comparative study of the laws of different countries, especially within the British Empire, is of considerable importance. The movement for the preservation of infant life derives stimulus from the example of the legislative lead given in several of the Dominions. The need for providing the means so that the mother deprived of the support of a husband may be enabled to devote herself to the care of her children is met by the United States legislation embodying provision for what are known as Mothers' Pensions. The solution to difficult questions such as the extent to which the legislature may interfere with the liberty of the subject in the treatment of venereal diseases is aided by a study of the action of legislative bodies of other countries. The lawyer, timorous of the possible consequences of admitting women into the legal profession, may have his fears assuaged by such a comprehensive study as that of Mr. Justice Riddell, of the Canadian Supreme Court, in a recent number of the *Journal of the Society of Comparative Legislation*, in which he concludes:—

“ If I were to sum up in a sentence the results of the admission of women to the practice of law from my experience and inquiry, I would say that it has done some good, and no harm, while all prophecies of ill results have been falsified ; that its effects on the profession and practice of law have been negligible, and that it is now regarded with indifference and as the normal and natural thing by Bench, Bar, and the community at large.”

Professor Cammeo, however, was not concerned with the value of the study of comparative legislation to particular sections of the community, but claimed that “ the researches in comparative jurisprudence acquire at the present moment an exceptional worth as preparatory to a well-grounded establishment of the League of Nations.” It is clear that legal unity on essential points is one of the primary conditions for an efficient working of the League. On the other hand, it is obvious that the total unification of the laws of all nations is neither practicable nor desirable. Thus Professor Cammeo takes it for granted “ that those branches of the law which are strictly connected with, and dependent upon the main features of each nation that go to the root of its peculiar ethnical, historical, political, economic tendencies, will remain outside the scope of unification.” There remain certain well-defined fields in which dissimilarity of legislation is an obstacle to closer intercourse between nations. The principal sphere in which greater unity is necessary is in the legislation connected in any way with trade

relationships. Conferences such as that which was held at The Hague in 1910 on the subject of securing uniformity in the law relating to bills of exchange could now become a recognised part of the machinery of the League of Nations. Bills of lading and other shipping subjects, companies, partnerships, and banking are among the matters which readily provide fruitful and important material for consideration and legislative action. French and Italian jurists have met together with a view to united action, especially in connection with foreign judgments, but there is yet some distance to be traversed before the British Empire, by securing unity in that matter within its own borders, is in a position to co-operate effectively with other nations. To commercial and maritime law Professor Cammeo would add the law of personal property, contracts and tort, and some branches of what on the Continent is known as administrative law as being suitable subjects for the work of unification. Among the last will be the legal aspects of international waterways and other matters which may be under the supervision of the League of Nations, so that the permanent secretariat will need to be adequately informed upon the legal as well as other aspects of such problems. At present it would hardly seem to be necessary to establish wide and elaborate machinery for the collection of the information, but rather to rely upon each nation to supply that which is essential so that the secretariat has only to register the material and preserve it in a form readily available for reference.

In order that this section of the work of the League of Nations may be adequately performed it will be necessary for the corresponding national organisation to be well equipped to make its own contribution. At The Hague has been established an Institute "to furnish for the general good, scientific, practical, and complete information on any subject of private and public international law, of legislation, jurisprudence, treaties, economic questions, statistical data, on everything in short appertaining to the revival of the pacific intercourse among the nations." The Scandinavian countries are about to follow suit. For the present it may be considered sufficient in other countries to aim primarily at the creation of an efficient organisation for official purposes.

The United States takes a leading place in the provision through library service, State departments, and substantially endowed private corporations for the collection, co-ordination, and dissemination of information. The report of the Librarian of Congress gives some particulars of what has been done by the Law Librarian who now directs the legal section of the Legislative Reference Service. Primarily this work is for the information of "Congress and committees and members thereof," but enquiries having been received from Government departments for information, which had been compiled, the Legislative Reference Service has informally acted, to some extent, as a clearing house of Government investigations. The war created a special demand for foreign legislation upon such subjects as the treatment of conscientious objectors, status of alien enemies, excess profits taxation, and various other subjects in which the legislators of the United States desired to

learn the experience of the belligerent countries in the solution of the problems which they had to face upon coming into the war.

In the United Kingdom there is no such general bureau of information, partly because Library administration has not developed to the same extent as in the United States. Government departments have been slowly groping their way in a search for information, and the Machinery of Government Committee of the Ministry of Reconstruction definitely record their opinion:—

“That adequate provision has not been made in the past for the organised acquisition of facts and information, and for the systematic application of thought, as preliminary to the settlement of policy and its administration.”

Besides the Department of Overseas Trade created to meet conditions arising from the war, from a fusion of sections of the Board of Trade and the Foreign Office, there are a General Economic Department of the former Office and an Intelligence Department of the Ministry of Labour, both recently formed for the purpose of conducting general enquiries. Some years ago the Board of Education appointed a Director of the Office of Special Inquiries and Reports, which has done admirable work, and just before the war an Intelligence Department was created at the Local Government Board from which has just been issued a useful, though not altogether unbiased, report upon Mothers' Pensions in the United States. But, welcome as these struggling efforts may be to base action upon knowledge, they are still somewhat haphazard and at present have only touched the fringe of legislative research.

The Imperial Bureau in this country required to inform the Imperial Secretariat of the League of Nations would need to deal very largely with legal matters. Even more necessary than an elaborate staff is a comprehensive library as a basis for its work; but in this country there is no library to answer that description. The only legal society, Imperial in its scope, is the Society of Comparative Legislation which was founded by Sir Courtenay Ilbert nearly a quarter of a century ago. With ridiculously inadequate means it has succeeded in publishing an annual summary of the laws published in all parts of the Empire contributed for the most part by writers with intimate knowledge of the local conditions. The last review, necessarily incomplete here and there on account of the circumstances under which it was compiled, is a bulky volume of nearly three hundred pages. In addition, the Journal of the Society contains articles upon the working of laws in different countries, and records the adoption of experiments in legislation, such as “Testator's Family Maintenance in New Zealand.” The Society is supported by the Inns of Court, with the exception of the Inner Temple, the Law Society, and the Royal Colonial Institute, so that it is in touch with the bodies possessing the material for legislative research work outside the Government Departments who co-operate in its activities. The work of the Society is appreciated far more in the United States and other parts of the British Empire than it is in the United Kingdom, and so makes a real and practical contribution to the unity of the English-

speaking peoples. There is, therefore, available the nucleus, trifling though it may seem compared with the larger organisations of other countries, of a bureau of legislative research. The Machinery of Government Committee appear to recommend the formation of a number of separate intelligence sections attached to each department and each maintaining its own library. So far as legislative research is concerned this is a wasteful and ineffective method of meeting the requirements, and results in a considerable amount of overlapping. Moreover, the expansion of this form of machinery could not be co-related without considerable difficulty to the work of the League of Nations. It is clear that if the representatives of the Empire upon the League and its constituent bodies are to be adequately informed, then in London there must be one Imperial Legislative Reference Bureau adequately equipped with the means to perform its work in a manner worthy of its importance to the Empire and its contribution to the maintenance of the hardly secured peace of nations.

C. E. A. BEDWELL.

HAWKS AND OWLS IN RELATION TO AGRICULTURE.

THE prejudice against Hawks and Owls that has ever existed in the mind of a large proportion of the agricultural community is a matter not difficult to account for. Our forefathers regarded most of the hawks as birds specially intended for sport, and various Acts of Parliament enacted the most severe penalties, even to that of capital punishment, for the destruction or taking of these birds. With such preservation it is easy to imagine that they were exceedingly plentiful, and in consequence agriculture, to a certain extent, may have suffered; but what probably was much more likely to cause such birds to be detested was that they were specially preserved for a section of the community who were not workers in any sense, and whose sport and general mode of life often bore hard upon the frugal agricultural population. This prejudice persisted long after the Acts of Parliament were repealed, and it still remains, to a lesser extent, even to the present day.

The case of the Owls is somewhat different. Most, if not all, are night birds, silent in their flight, singular in appearance, and often associated with ruins, &c.; no wonder, then, that superstitions of various kinds quickly became associated with these beautiful birds. Once they were regarded as birds of ill-omen it was an easy matter for other wrongs, equally absurd and untrue, to be laid to their charge. Whether our view is the right one or not, there is no denying the fact that a strong prejudice does exist against the above-mentioned birds, and of recent years they have been considerably reduced in numbers. It would, therefore, seem desirable to review in some detail our knowledge of their food and feeding habits, with a view to a better understanding of their economic position, especially as regards their relationship to agriculture.

The majority of our raptorial birds are too rare to claim attention here, and so far as agriculture is concerned are a negligible factor, but we have at least two fairly common species of hawks, and it is with these that we are now more particularly concerned. These two species are the Sparrow Hawk and the Kestrel. As the result of an examination of 109 specimens of the former species and 80 of the latter, we have shown that of the total food consumed by the Sparrow Hawk in a year, 97.5 per cent. of the total bulk consists of animal food, which is composed of 16.5 per cent. of game-birds, 9.5 per cent. of poultry, 6.5 per cent. of ducklings, 4.5 per cent. of insectivorous birds, 4.5 per cent. of beneficial insects, 19.5 per cent. of blackbirds, sparrows, and wood pigeons, 15.0 per cent. of injurious insects, 6.5 per cent. of mice, 5.5 per cent. of insects of a neutral nature, and 9.5 per cent. of miscellaneous animal matter. Thus of the total record for the year we must place 47.0 per cent. of the food against this bird as injuries, 45.0 per cent. as benefits, and 8 per cent. as of a neutral nature. It will thus be seen that the injuries inflicted are, so far as the bulk of the food is concerned,

greater than the benefits, but the latter do not warrant us advocating any protection for this species.

As regards the Kestrel, we have a very different balance-sheet to compare. Here the total animal food consumed during the year is 99 per cent., and only 1 per cent. vegetable food. Of the former 64.5 per cent. consists of mice and voles, 8.5 per cent. of sparrows, blackbirds, and thrushes, 6 per cent. of nestling birds, 16.5 per cent. of injurious insects, 2.5 per cent. of earthworms, and 1 per cent. of frogs. With the exception of the 6 per cent. of nestling birds, and 4.5 per cent. of food of a neutral nature, the whole of the food consumed by this species is all in its favour. It is somewhat difficult to realise the enormous numbers of mice and voles that constitute the 64.5 per cent. of this food.

Of the various species of owls we have only four that may be said to be sufficiently numerous to warrant consideration here, viz., the Barn Owl, the Tawny or Brown Owl, the Long-eared Owl, and the Short-eared Owl. Whatever doubt may exist in the mind as to the economic position of the hawks, there can be but one opinion as to the value of owls. Practically the whole of the food consumed is animal matter, and the bulk of this consists of mice, rats, shrews, moles, injurious insects, frogs, and wild birds. Hooper* states that nine-tenths of the Barn Owls' food consists of mice.

A fairly reliable index to the food of certain birds can be obtained by examining what are termed "pellets." The hawks and owls frequently swallow their captures whole or in several pieces. After these have remained in the stomach for a time, during which period the nutritious elements have been absorbed, the indigestible portions, such as bones, feathers, hair, scales, &c., are, by the action of the muscles of the stomach, made up into small solid balls or "pellets," which are regurgitated before another meal is commenced. Mr. L. E. Adams† examined 1,124 of these pellets of the barn owl, and found remains of 2,407 mice and rats, 97 sparrows, and 81 other birds. We have examined 83 pellets‡, and found remains of 121 mice, 33 sparrows, and 5 other birds, and remains of cockchafers and other beetles. Dr. Altum examined 706 pellets of the Barn Owl, and found remains of 1,590 shrew mice, 693 voles, 237 mice, 3 rats, 16 bats, and 22 birds, mostly sparrows. In 210 pellets of the Tawny Owl there were remains of 296 voles, 42 mice, 33 shrews, 6 rats, 48 moles, 18 small birds and numerous cockchafers; whilst 25 pellets of the Long-eared Owl showed remains of 35 voles, 6 mice, and 2 small birds. In the case of the Tawny Owl we examined 108 pellets, which revealed remains of 144 mice and rats, 14 sparrows, and 4 other small birds. Dr. A. K. Fisher§, of the United States Biological Survey, found in 1,247 pellets of their Barn Owl 1,991 skulls of the short-tailed field mouse, 656 of the house mouse, 210 of the common rat, and 147 of other small rodents, and 2 shrews.

During a long experience in investigations of this kind,

* *Journ. Soc. Arts*, 1906, vol. lv., pp. 72-88.

† *Journ. N'amp't. N.H. Soc.*, 1898, pp. 45-55.

‡ *Food of Some Brit. Birds*, 1913, p. 63.

§ *U.S. Dept. Agric., Div. Ornith., Bull. No. 3*, 1893, pp. 1-210.

we have never met with a single authenticated case of any species of owl destroying young game birds; as Mr. Archibald states*: "A small amount of reflection makes the practical impossibility of such a proceeding manifest, for the reason that young pheasants and partridges are safely hidden beneath their mothers' wings long before the tawny owl considers it fit to stir abroad." But even supposing that the owls do take a certain number of young game birds, though it is significant that no one has ever reported finding remains of such in the pellets, the overwhelming benefits they confer upon the game preserver and the farmer are out of all proportion to the injuries.

Various computations have been made as to the losses the country suffers from the depredations of and damage caused by rats, voles, and mice. Dr. Shipley† has estimated the amount in the case of the Brown Rat to be about £10,000,000 per year. Sir James Crichton-Brown‡ places the amount at £15,000,000, and others have assessed it still higher. The Long-tailed Field Mouse from time to time increases to such an extent as to constitute a plague. That of 1814 in the Forest of Dean has frequently been commented upon. In 1874-1876 another plague raged in Wensleydale. Again in 1890-1892, in the South of Scotland, there was a very serious outbreak of this pest. The Board of Agriculture appointed a Departmental Committee to inquire into its causes; to cope, if possible, with its results; and to suggest means for the prevention of its recurrence. The Report§ of the Committee states that the cause was ascribed to the mildness of the four or five preceding winters, and the destruction of hawks, buzzards, owls, stoats, and weasels by persons interested in the preservation of game. "A preponderance of opinion amongst farmers is reported tracing the cause of the present outbreak to the scarcity of owls, kestrels, hawks, weasels, and other vermin." The plague extended over an area sixty miles in length, and from twelve to twenty in breadth.

In 1892 and 1893 Mr. Peter Adair** issued two most valuable reports on this outbreak. He states: "Farmers and shepherds are almost unanimously of opinion that the recent vole plague is a result of the destruction of birds and animals of prey, stress being laid on the value of the Owl, Kestrel, Rook, and Black-headed Gull." In all such cases it is exceedingly difficult to apportion the losses with any degree of accuracy, but if we allow a certain sum per acre of the total area affected, a rough idea may be obtained of the damage sustained. An outbreak in the lower part of the Humboldt Valley, U.S.A., in 1906-7†† on 20,000 acres of land, of which 15,000 were seriously injured, resulted in a loss of £4 3s. 4d. per acre, or a total of nearly £63,000.

It is obvious that the total sum of losses caused by these and allied animals must annually reach an enormous amount; therefore, any natural enemy or enemies of such pests would, one would

* *Journ. Roy. Agric. Soc.*, 1893, pp. 1-27.

† *Journ. Econ. Biol.*, 1908, vol. iii., p. 66.

‡ *Journ. Incorp. Soc. Destruct. Vermin.* 1908, vol. i., p. 74.

§ *Board Agric. Rpts. on the Plague of Field Mice in Scotland*, 1892, p. 4.

** *Scot. Nat.*, 1892, pp. 219-231; 1893, pp. 193-202.

†† *U.S. Dept. Agric., Farmers Bull.*, 352, 1909, p. 9.

suppose, be most rigorously protected, but as it is they are either regarded with typical British apathy and indifference or persecuted and destroyed. We fully admit that gamekeepers, especially in Scotland, are not, as a class, the culprits, but that a very large number of birds are annually destroyed and of the eggs stolen of others there is overwhelming evidence. Dr. A. K. Fisher, the eminent economic ornithologist of the U.S. Government, writing of the offering of bounties for the destruction of hawks and owls, states:* "Fortunately, the work has not been carried far enough to do the harm that has resulted from the long-continued efforts of gamekeepers in Great Britain."

We do not for one moment contend that any State protection of wild birds will ever rid us of rats and mice, but seeing that so large a portion of their food consists of these rodents, these same species of birds must constitute a very important factor in limiting their increase. Further, we must remember that we know of no other agency that will so easily and constantly reduce these pests. All who have tried artificial means of combating them know how exceedingly difficult, and often unsatisfactory, such prove. We have no easy method, and therefore the benefit conferred by these birds that prey upon them for food is greatly enhanced in value.

Placing on one side all prejudice, and after carefully weighing the bare facts known in connection with the feeding habits of hawks and owls, let us ask the question, "Is the sum total of these birds' activities prejudicial or beneficial to agriculture?" In other words, "Does the destruction of rats, field mice, and injurious insects, which constitute the bulk of these birds' food, compensate for the considerably smaller percentage of injuries which they inflict?" We venture to state that no impartial tribunal, after a true consideration of the facts, can come to any other but one conclusion, which we may sum up as follows:—

1. Most of our raptorial birds are too rare or too few in number to affect the question, but even in these cases from what we know of their feeding habits they probably confer benefits which fully compensate for the harm they occasionally do.

2. Of the two common species of hawks, the Sparrow Hawk and the Kestrel, the former is certainly injurious to young game birds, poultry, and insectivorous birds, and such injuries are scarcely compensated for by the benefits it confers; but with reference to the Kestrel there can be no question that it is one of the most beneficial birds we have, and the benefits it confers on agriculture are of such a nature as entitle it to the most efficient protection.

3. The four commoner species of owls, the Barn Owl, the Tawny or Brown Owl, the Long-Eared and the Short-Eared Owls, are all birds of the greatest value to agriculture; indeed, it would be difficult to overestimate their importance.

The question naturally arises with reference to the Kestrel and the Owls, "Are these birds sufficiently protected?" "Has the administration of the Wild Birds Protection Act of 1880 secured

* *U.S. Dept. Agric., Biol. Surv.*, 1907, Circ. No. 61, p. 5.

for them the measure of protection they deserve?" Both of these questions have unfortunately to be answered in the negative.

How can we claim that they are sufficiently protected, or that the Act of 1880 is little more than a dead letter, when any farm hand or other person can destroy them with impunity? As Mr. Archibald* observes: "It is a matter of wonder that they [Hawks] have survived the constant and bitter warfare carried on by pheasant preservers and others;" and again: "In many localities these poor birds [Owls] are relentlessly persecuted by game-keepers and loafers, and even by the farmers themselves, who, above all others, ought to do their utmost to protect their feathered benefactors." These birds are shot and trapped and their eggs taken all over the country. The birds can be purchased in the skin, stuffed†, and even made up as fire-screens! They can be bought alive, and their eggs obtained in quantity from numerous dealers. This is the kind and extent of the protection that is meted out to birds that are rendering incalculable service to the farmer and the nation at large.

In the cumulative effect of the feeding habits of our beneficial wild birds we have a natural force the might and importance of which we have as yet but dimly realised. From time immemorial, ever since man first cultivated the soil, a constant war has been waged between him and his foes: the latter are many, and by no means a feeble folk. They devastate wide acres of produce, or take a rich toll of the harvest; they even invade the granaries, and still further reduce the hard-won gain. Much as artificial devices have reduced some of these foes, they still reappear in countless hosts, and baffle all man's schemes for their destruction; and yet quietly and unobtrusively there is also a mighty natural force at work, so adjusting the activities of animal life that the balance of Nature will be preserved, and that none of these shall become plagues; and this beneficent factor, this gratuitous and friendly aid, has been, and is being, treated either with apathetic contempt or open aggression.

In other countries these subjects have not been thought unworthy of deep consideration and long investigation by trained minds, but in Great Britain the State, as yet, has not deemed them of sufficient importance to exercise its time, except on rare occasions, and then has acted inefficiently or in ignorance. The continuance of such ineptitude constitutes a grave menace to successful agriculture and a vital danger to the people of the United Kingdom.

As Mr. William Berry‡ has recently stated: "The whole subject does in truth call loudly for systematic, impartial, and continuous investigation." Such an investigation can only be productive of good, for without a detailed and exact knowledge of the subject it is impossible to act wisely, either as regards protection or repression, and in the absence of comprehensive and reliable statistics we are annually handicapping our greatest national industry.

WALTER E. COLLINGE.

* Op. cit.

† Mr. J. H. Gurney states (*British Birds*, 1918, vol. xi., p. 253) that he once counted the skins of forty-six Barn Owls in a bird-stuffer's shop in Norfolk.

‡ *Scot. Nat.*, 1917, p. 134.

LITERARY SUPPLEMENT.

LIST OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
1. THE MAGIC BOWL OF BAGHDAD. By J. E. G. DE M. ...	581
2. REVIEWS	585
THEORIES OF THE STATE; CHRONOLOGY OF THE WAR; ITALY AND HER WAR; HENRY BARCLAY SWETE; ENGLISH LITURGICAL COLOURS.	
3. SHORTER REVIEWS	595
4. NOTICES OF BOOKS	599

THE MAGIC BOWL OF BAGHDAD.

THOSE who live in a great city rarely realise its magnitude. They are part of it. It needs a stranger to grasp the wholeness of the hive, to compare it with other hives, and measure the unfamiliar sweetnesss. The stranger has time to think, to estimate, to hear the bells, to feel the rustle of a crowd that he is in but not of, to take in the perspective of avenues, the ups and downs of city hills, the winding of alleys, the height and slope of houses and churches, the *timbre* of cries, the shadows and lights and sounds and scents, the tints of evening, the quiet fall of night in unfamiliar streets and on citted rivers. To the Baghdadi London is a city not made with hands, a gigantic unity and reality, a single jewel that rules the world; to the Londoner Baghdad is a mystical and endless maze of alleys, vast out of all sense of reasonableness, a thing teeming with mystery and life, a city enshrining the all-enveloping magic of the immemorial east in one jewelled moonstone lined with a million veins of life. But each is measured by some higher unity, some city laid up in heaven.

Baghdad sees many strange foreigners wandering in its bazaars. Fugitives from Armenistan, from Ispahan, from wherever the Christians of the Middle East are slaughtered, Jews from Aleppo, Smyrna, Antioch, Turks from the Bosporus, Russians, Persians, Kurds, mingle with the dwellers of Mesopotamia, and not least strange are the men from Ultima Thule, from Britain. It is a place of wandering wondering strangers who gather here as they gathered in Babylon, in the land of dreams and shadowy shapes, of magical enchantment, the land between the brimming rivers where Haroun al Rashid wandered in the moonlit nights of breathless wonderment. But perhaps even Baghdad in its hushed teeming twilights sees not so many strange men as London; and the Thames is not less mysterious than the Tigris. For the Thames the Channel is the Euphrates, and she flows down from London Bridge with her mystic cargoes of human souls as hungry for the Channel tides as ever the Tigris is for the slow throb of the Euphrates across the Mesopotamian Marsh, the vast land of floods and fruitfulness. London, the Baghdad, the

Babylon, of the West, hungers, too, for the sound of many waters and hides in her bosom mysterious strangers who come and go with tidings of strange things. This warm May evening one of these strangers emerges from some alleys north of Holborn, wanders across Red Lion Square and drifts in dreamy fashion across the tide of traffic and into Lincoln's Inn Fields. To those who look for wonderful creatures, many are vouchsafed in London, Chinamen magnificently robed, with pigtail hanging even to the heels, may be seen in the open daylight of Chancery Lane. Turbanned men, negroes, American Indians, lords of the yellow races, may be seen in strange attire, but rarely perhaps so curious a figure as this man. Tall, proud, with fixed gaze he strides along heedless of the evening hum of humanity. He wears the Zaboon or inner white cloak that the Baghdadi wear; above this, to meet the chill of a western climate, he wears the Abba cloak of Baghdad, an outer cloak woven of camel's hair striped brown and white. The evening is close and he wears it open with the Zaboon shining beneath. Upon his head is a turban, significantly green, with the folds hanging down his back. A man of great height dressed in such fashion drew the eyes of all, but he was unconscious of the stir that he made. The children as he crossed Red Lion Square were too frightened to call after him, a wonderful, almost terrible figure, with its little black beard, the half-glazed eyes, the gliding movement. He wandered in Lincoln's Inn Fields as if expecting some one. He stopped under the trees in the growing twilight and lifted high his hands as if invoking some evening God of the Marshes of Mesopotamia. Even as he stood there, a solitary figure, for children who play late in that historic spot had shrunk away, the closing bell rang. He perhaps thought that it was an answer to his prayer and at the same instant a soldier rose from a seat and came towards him. "Who would have thought to have seen you here, Shamran son of Hellowa?" said the Englishman in perfect Arabic. "I knew that thou wast needing me again, Richard son of Robert," replied the Baghdadi, "I heard your call." "But why, how, are you in London?" "The sea brought me. I am here. I am a messenger from a king of the East to the kings of the West. I go to the City of the Franks. I have Frankish blood in my veins, kings' blood they say. I carry peace from East to West." "Well, we must leave here, anyway," said the soldier. "Haroun can't carry on in London like he did in Baghdad."

He led the way, and soon they were back in Holborn, and presently, climbing innumerable stairs of an old building, the soldier and the man who had been at Mecca were in a panelled room, high up above the roar of moonlit London. "Why did you call?" said the Baghdadi, squatting by the cheerful fire. "I want to know if my brother is alive or dead. If anyone knows, you know." Shamran stroked his beard. "Allah is good," he said. "We shall see." Another soldier was writing at a table. The Inkstand before him was of silver, curiously fashioned with what looked like endless writing on its grey moony surface. The Baghdadi's eyes flashed as he saw the Inkstand. "The Bowl," he

said, "have you the Bowl, too?" "Yes," said Richard, son of Robert, "we have the Bowl. Where is it, William?" "I put the roses in it," said William, nodding to the Mesopotamian in a friendly fashion. "It is on the little table by the fire." The foreigner went up to the table, and taking the bunch of yellow roses out emptied the water into the coal scuttle, and polished the Bowl anxiously with his robe. "It is good that they were yellow roses, not red," said he. "Why?" asked the Sergeant at the writing table, lifting his head for a moment and showing a very British mustachioed face. "Red is blood, yellow is gold. It may be an omen. But dream and see." "What tomfoolery is he up to?" said the Sergeant to his friend. "Hush!" said the other, "do you not remember all he did for us in the desert?" "I should think I do, fine old buck, old Shamran, Son of the Beautiful. But what is he at here in work-a-day London? Just look." The strange figure had taken the little table to a spot where the full moonlight fell into the room. On the table he placed the large silver Bowl, and into it he was pouring something from a silver Flask inscribed with what looked like endless sentences, repeated over and over again, as on the Inkstand and the Bowl. Then he bade them extinguish the lamp. A fitful fire flickered across the moonlight, which filled half the shadow-haunted room. "Foolery, foolery," muttered the Sergeant. "Jack Robertson is dead. I saw him carried into the Arab's tent west of Nisibin. Why, you and I wouldn't have slipped off with the mullah if we hadn't known he was dead." "I always said he would get better," said the brother, "but you were my Sergeant, and I had to go." "We could do nothing," said the Sergeant, "and there was just the chance. Life is sweet."

"Life," said the Mesopotamian in soft-flowing Arabic, "life is sweet. How sweet, the infidel knoweth not. What do you know of the true raptures of life, you who dwell beyond the fold? It is sweet even as pure water and hanging fruits and green grasses under the date trees in the desert. There is a sweetness of life that only the believer knows where the arid desert of this life, blown across with the burning winds of passion and the whipping sands of pain, is gone for evermore, and man purified, beautified, beatified, walks (as I indeed walk) in the Paradise of God, in gardens where no sand is, and the voices of women are low and sweet as the murmur of bubbling waters. Life is sweet. John, son of Robert, loved life better than you loved it. Yet he gave it, or thought that he gave it, for you. He loved his brother and his friend. Therefore life was sweeter to him." "We thought he was dead," said the men, "or we would have stayed." The Mesopotamian towered in the moonlight, and extended his arms to the moon. Thrice he did this, and then he prostrated himself at the foot of the table on which the Bowl stood. Slowly he rose, and waved his hands above the Bowl. "Shut your eyes," he said. The men obeyed. "Now look," he whispered in a far-off, dreamy voice, "look: it is almost morning."

The men, as they opened their eyes, saw as it were a new universe rising from the Bowl. The rim of the Bowl became the

edges of the limitless desert, and on the Eastern edge they saw the tremor of the dawn on the horizon of the arid wastes of Hither Asia. London had gone. The two men were back again on the desert march from Mosul to the Taurus range. The dreadful day was coming to greet the scarcely less dreadful night. The strange weird beauty of the desert dawn had come. Some Arab tents, a group of misshapen camel, some mounted Kurds, lances in hand, showed against the growing light. A sudden morning wind, a breath of the furnace, lashed their faces, their parched mouths black with thirst moved in fear of the coming sun, their wounds ached, their lacerated feet dragged slowly on. Their glazed eyes opened and closed with the sleep that vermin and thirst denied them. So they turned from the dawn, and hardly heeding the crack of whips, the prick of lances, the wretched prisoners of war stumbled on along the stony way facing the helpless West. Such misery is rare in the records of the human race. Rare are human woes wherein no comfort is. These walking skeletons, survivors of siege and war, too strong to die, smitten with days of agony under pitiless glaring skies, robbed of foot-gear, head-gear, clothing, naked to all the outrages of pitiless devilish enemies, burdened with honourable wounds, swarming with lice, devoured of flies, tottering with fever and disease, these brave enduring iron men staggered on without comfort save such help as comes from invincible fortitude of soul, from unconquerable contempt for their tormentors, from love for one another. They could not help each other. Their escort saw to that, and when a man fell and died they could but glance at him with eyes of imperishable remembrance and stagger on. When the sun was high they stopped by some Arab tents pitched in the barren wilderness, and waited for the falling of the sun with such sustenance as their captors chose to supply for the delaying of slow-footed death. The two soldiers looked out upon the scene from their London fastness, and presently they saw themselves lying on the sand outside a squat Arab tent, and they saw beside them in this vision of themselves a third man. A voice whispered, "John son of Robert lies there." Anxiously they looked. Surely he was a corpse already. The eyes were closed, and the greyness of death had crept over the naked sun-tanned form. The sun was nearly down the West. It was time to move again. The Sergeant and Richard shuddered and heaved each other up, and bent to lift John. But his eyes remained closed. His body was limp. Surely the Deliverer had passed that way. The gaping wound on his thigh had ceased to drip. The soldiers watched the re-enacting of the dreadful scene. Suddenly hoarse cries commanded the resumption of the march, and as suddenly they saw Shamran son of Hellowa come, none knew whence, and lift the body and bear it into the tent. It was done in a moment, even as the stars rushed out into the pitiless Bowl of God. The two men looked at each other. The two men in London heard the Sergeant say hoarsely to Richard, "Come, my lad, your brother is out of our care. March." And after one terrible look they marched on into the dreadful night.

They watched the darkling scene. An eerie light lay over it, and the soldiers saw themselves creeping along hour after fearful hour. They saw the miracle happen. They saw Shamran come behind them in the darkness and stay them, and lead them away from the column, away into the desert from the one known track. In the darkness they watched themselves, each holding an arm of the Mesopotamian, and stumbling on for what seemed interminable hours. Presently the moon rose, and its rays fell on a small encampment where a little eager-eyed Arab girl stood by the almost monstrous shape, for so it seemed in the desert moonlight, of a camel. Shamran bowed before them and said, "What would my lords? All that is mine is theirs." And in the strange light as he bowed he looked to them even as a visitant from heaven, as a son of God. The two men in London watched the scene, and saw the good Samaritan bring them back to life on his green oasis. "Do you remember?" they kept saying to each other. "Do you remember?" "Yes, yes, there are his children, there is his mother Hellowa, there is his brother taking out the flocks." "Why did he not save John?" said Richard. "John could not have walked. He was beyond help, our help, Shamran's help, even if he was alive. John is dead. We were right to let ourselves be saved. Life is sweet."

And they heard a voice beside them repeat, "is sweet." And they rubbed their eyes. The desert scene had gone. The Bowl had gone. The lamp was alight again. And even as they rubbed their eyes they saw sitting in a chair a third soldier; but Shamran was gone. John had come back. He had been saved after all. He had lived through captivity in more kindly hands than most. He was free. They questioned him, but he had nothing to say save the old familiar story of the captivity. Yes, he had one thing to say. Shamran, who had saved him, was dead. That he learnt at Aleppo. "But he was here to-night." "Oh! no. He is dead. His mother sent me his Bowl, which is now in my knapsack." "But he was here to-night." "Oh! no. You must have dreamt it." Then the Sergeant saw on the table by the Inkstand some wet writing in Arabic characters which said: "Life is sweet, even my life where I am, which is neither Baghdad nor London, but a city nobler than these." The Sergeant read it aloud. "Yes," said Richard, "he was here this evening, Shamran the son of Hellowa." And the three men sat and mused: Shamran, son of the Beautiful.

J. E. G. DE M.

REVIEWS.

THEORIES OF THE STATE.*

The relations between the State and the individual form the main problem not only of political science but of the art of government.

* *Democracy at the Crossways.* By F. J. C. Hearnshaw. Macmillan.

Roads to Freedom. By Bertrand Russell. Allen & Unwin.

The Metaphysical Theory of the State. By L. H. Hobhouse. Allen & Unwin.

Everyone admits that the citizen has duties as well as rights, and everyone agrees that there are limits to the power of the executive. But publicists in all ages have been attracted either to the cult of the individual or to the authority of the State, according to their temperament and their interpretation of the needs of the time. Both schools have commanded the allegiance of eminent thinkers, and both are able to make out a good case for the faith that is in them.

The latest champion of the State is Professor Hearnshaw, whose "Democracy at the Crossways" will impress every reader by its wide learning, its obvious power, and its clearness of statement. He defines his book as "an attempt to apply the lessons of history and the principles of political science to some of the urgent practical problems of the present day." His creed, briefly summarised in a preface, is that representative democracy is the best type of government in modern States, and that its essence is the rule of the majority, unhampered by such devices as the initiative, the referendum, and proportional representation. After devoting a third of his pages to a lucid discussion of the theory of democracy and a rapid survey of its history, he plunges into the controversies of to-day, and in four chapters entitled, Sectionalism, Socialism, Syndicalism, Anarchism, he declares war on what he believes to be the deadliest enemies of democracy. At this point we exchange the tranquil atmosphere of the study for the din of the streets. Our author belabours his opponents with immense vigour. These pages will be read with delight by those who share his standpoint; but other readers who are neither socialists, syndicalists, nor anarchists, will probably feel that his reasoning would be more impressive if his tone was less censorious. He has, for instance, a perfect right to consider the so-called Guild Socialists knaves and fools; but it is an error in taste and tactics to say so.

The burden of Professor Hearnshaw's lament is the weakness of the executive power. "One of the most disquieting features of recent British politics has been the feebleness of the successive Governments which have nominally ruled the kingdom. Ministers who ought to have been strong in the consciousness that they represented the sovereign people have, one after the other, vacillated and cringed before illegal strikers, Sinn Fein rebels, turbulent ecclesiastics, conscientious objectors, syndicalist shop-stewards, and indeed any group of antagonists possessed of political influence and capable of offering organised resistance." His programme is what Lord Salisbury used to call "resolute government." But who is to carry it out? Since politicians have failed, is it not time that the professors should try their hand at the ungrateful task of governing their fellow-citizens?

If Professor Hearnshaw is the lineal and worthy descendant of Fitzjames Stephen and Maine, Mr. Bertrand Russell and Professor Hobhouse brilliantly represent the rival tradition of Mill. Like the author of the immortal essay on Liberty, they regard the State with something like suspicion. They recognise its necessity, but they fear the untempered strength of its arm. Mr. Russell surveys sympathetically some of the "Roads to Freedom" along which the mind of the modern world has sought escape from the

numbing embrace of the Great Leviathan. Professor Hobhouse delivers a weighty attack on the Hegelian doctrine of the omnipotent State and on Professor Bosanquet, its latest English champion. He is convinced that the State is best served by encouraging the individual to self-realisation in accordance with law. "The elevation of a State above men means at the bottom the supremacy of power. It is the natural creed of an aristocracy or a bureaucracy, as insistence on personality is the natural creed of a people."

G. P. G.

* * *

CHRONOLOGY OF THE WAR.*

This Chronology of the War and the accompanying excellent small Atlas of the various fields of operation which is issued under official auspices will be found invaluable to students of the many complexities of the greatest war recorded in history and should be placed on the shelves of all historical libraries large or small. The Chronology has been compiled from the *Times* newspaper, corrected, checked, and amplified by various histories and records such as Mr. Buchan's history of the war, the many blue and other coloured official books of the various belligerents, certain published "diaries" in periodicals, and some material from French and German and other foreign publications. The editors state that:—

"The Chronology has been compiled with the greatest care from the most reliable authorities—English, French, and German—and when these give different dates for the same event, every effort has been made to arrive at the right one. At the same time it cannot be denied that where equally good authorities (even official ones in some cases) differ, it is more than possible that some errors may have crept in. The editors do not, however wish to overburden the text by giving the various authorities for conflicting dates: they must, therefore, content themselves with appealing to their readers to assist them in discovering any errors, fixing the correct dates, and notifying them for correction in a subsequent issue."

It is, of course, obvious that in a future edition much information of the first importance not now available for official reasons will be supplied. When this material is available, with such corrections as actors in the war will readily supply, the work will be one of great historical importance. The maps are small and, of course of necessity, omit much detail that is necessary for the intensive study of campaigns, such, for instance, as the struggle in Mesopotamia and the march of the British prisoners of war across the desert. It would be useful from the point of view of the record of prisoners of war if maps were added illustrating their sojourn and their melancholy labours and miseries in Germany and Asia Minor.

The Chronology comprises Tables of contemporaneous events followed by a summary of the events of each year with appendices

* *Chronology of the War*, issued under the Auspices of the Ministry of Information. (5s. net.) *Small Atlas of the War* (companion to the *Chronology of the War*.) (Constable. 5s. net.)

"explaining and enlarging on certain important events." An adequate Index enlarges the material in the text, a useful device, and there is an Introduction tracing the history of the events preceding the outbreak of hostilities, and there are also abstracts of events in the various theatres of war. An extraordinary amount of material is crowded into these 211 pages which cover the events of 1914 and the whole of 1915. Further volumes are in course of preparation. Major-General Lord Edward Gleichen, who planned and mainly edited the work, is to be congratulated on the result. He was largely assisted by Professor F. J. C. Hearnshaw, Mr. L. C. Jane, Mr. H. C. O'Neill (in the early stages), and a number of very competent compilers. The Chronology rightly begins with the opening of the Kiel Canal, 23rd June, 1914, for this fact was the German signal for the war.

* * *

ITALY AND HER WAR.*

There is an unusual fitness of things in the fact that Mr. G. M. Trevelyan, one of the chief lovers of modern Italy, and the brilliant chronicler of the most striking episodes of the *Risorgimento*, should also chronicle the final struggle that has gone to the making of the unity of which Mazzini, Garibaldi, and Cavour dreamed. In this struggle Mr. Trevelyan played an active and brilliant part as the Commandant of the First British Red Cross Unit for Italy, from August, 1915, to the end. We commend this book to those who have momentarily doubted the purity of Italian motives in entering the great war. Her first act in the struggle—the decision to resist manifold German, and perhaps we may add Vatican, influences, and remain neutral—was an act untouched by selfishness. "This first great decision, being made so swiftly and with such clear popular approval, saved France on the Marne by allowing her to strip her Alpine frontier. The Triple Alliance disappeared by the act of its just interpretation, and left no speck of dishonour on Italian statecraft." To the Germans the decision was a bitter blow, for it showed that the all-enveloping plan of Pan-Germanism had failed in Italy. Italy had realised in time that while Germany dominated her, her nationality was incomplete and her political independence was threatened. The realisation of these facts, as Mr. Trevelyan points out, formed indeed "the transition from the argument for neutrality in 1914 to the argument for war against the Central Powers in 1915." The very fact that the Germans, with their usual political unwisdom, argued that Italy must be dependent on Germany or on England, hardened Italian determination to show that she was a politically independent nationality. If Germany won the war, with or without the assistance of Italy, Italian freedom would be thenceforth impossible. Italian idealism—the same idealism that had flung off the Austrian yoke sixty years ago—saw that the only hope for a

* *Scenes from Italy's War.* By G. M. Trevelyan. With Frontispiece and Twelve Maps. (T. C. & E. C. Jack. 10s. 6d. net.)

really independent Italy capable of free development was to help the Entente Powers to overthrow the Central Powers. In Italy, as elsewhere, there was a conflict between materialism and idealism. The materialists, there as here, saw prosperity in slavery to Germany, and had no objection to the fall of free institutions and the destruction of free nations, if material prosperity was the immediate result. It was, writes Mr. Trevelyan,

“ a contest between two conceptions of the life of man and of nations—a moral and spiritual against a non-moral and material. The victory of the lower principle would have been decisive for generations to come in Italy, and probably also in the world at large, seeing that even with Italy’s intervention the Allies have only just been able to hold the fort till the arrival of the Americans. This struggle between a frankly idealist and a frankly materialist view of human affairs was not the outcome of mere passing political circumstances, but of a native dualism in the Italian character and philosophy.”

No doubt it is true enough that in Italy “ materialism and idealism are found side by side in much sharper contrast than in England,” but the same internal struggle went on here, and the struggle here was more painful in a sense, for the idealists who declared that the war must be fought to a finish in the interests of humanity were frankly dubbed militarists and many other offensive names, while the materialists shrouded their desires and their materialism under passionate appeals to the principles of brotherhood and peace. But, fortunately for humanity, the idealists won in England as well as in Italy.

The first year of war showed Italians what the Germans really were, and the attempt of German politicians to dictate to the Italian Government awakened even the ignorant and politically stolid though shrewd Italian masses:—

“ The Italians are not a great parliamentary nation, but they are a great democratic nation, and in times of political crises like 1860 and 1915 the people were endowed with remarkable sense and vigour. At such moments, which form the tide in the affairs of man, the ‘ Popolo ’ goes down into the streets and takes things into his own hands, supporting Cavour or Garibaldi, Salandra and Sonnino, as the occasion may require.”

So on May 24th, 1915, “ the final war of the *Risorgimento* began.” In June and July Mr. Trevelyan was moving between London and Rome arranging for the formation and acceptance of a British Red Cross Ambulance Unit. He saw much of what was going on. He considers that the Roman Church

“ did little direct harm to the patriotic cause in the army itself, but much in the country behind. The same cannot be said of the anti-war politicians. It is possible to select the chaplain for a regiment, but not the socialists. . . . Both in Rome that summer, and in all Italy inside and outside the war zone from 1915 to 1918, the touchstone of enthusiasm for the war has been friendliness to England, and the touchstone of indifference or aversion to the war has been Anglophobia.”

It was unfortunate that some five centuries of "constant traffic between England and Italy in the finest goods of civilisation, and, since the days of Mazzini and Cavour, in what we may call the finest goods of politics," had run rather thin in the years immediately before the war. "Our ignorance of Continental Europe had reached its zenith at the moment when we found ourselves protagonists in the greatest European war of all time." But the natural sympathy of mind, temper, and ideals, was soon renewed when once we had joined hands against Germany, and that renewal is not likely to be of merely temporal value. The experience of Mr. Trevelyan's Unit affords proof that "the contact of England and Italy might be much closer than it is, if only more of our people would set about it in the right spirit, and take the requisite pains to get into personal touch." The men of his Unit, in nine cases out of ten, knew neither Italy nor Italian, yet they at once, as this fascinating narrative shows, rapidly entered into kinship with the Italians.

There are two sides to this book. One we have shown something of: the revelation of the Italian spirit and the power of Italian idealism to conquer the materialism not only of Italy but of the age. That idealism was shown throughout the war, and, if we may draw deductions from the facts revealed by Mr. Trevelyan, is guiding Italian statesmen at the Conference table in Paris. They went into the war to secure perfect freedom of nationality and political independence. This they will fight for in the Council Chamber, as they have done, with a pertinacity, a capacity, and a success adequately described by Mr. Trevelyan's brilliant pen, in the field or rather in the Alps and on the rivers of Northern Italy, or what should be Northern Italy. The demand of idealism for the frontiers which will secure the ideals which dominated the war will certainly be granted. We may trust Signor Orlando, despite current difficulties, to ask no more than this, but to stand out until he secures all this. Every lover of Italy will stand with him, and Mr. Wilson's words at Rome on January 3rd, 1919, quoted in this volume, are a guarantee that the demands of idealism will be granted, while those of materialism will be refused. It was to the common people of Italy, and the common people of the Entente generally, that "we owe the glory of this great achievement," the marvellous ending of the war. The people of Italy are entitled to the reward of their heroic efforts, and that reward should be the removal of all fear as to freedom and political independence in the future. That the great Peace Conference will secure this and will satisfy the Italian Government and the Italian people in every reasonable demand we do not doubt at all.

Of the other side of the book—the actual narrative of the war, as seen by Mr. Trevelyan and his valiant fellow workers—we have little space to write. At the moment it seems chiefly important to dwell on the spirit of the claims of Italy and on the future co-ordination of the English and Italian peoples. Here the reader will study something of the wonders of Italian engineering during the war, something of the great Italian regiments, the Bersaglieri, the Alpini, the Arditi, the mighty Granatieri. The student of the

campaign will see the taking of Gorizia, the story of the Carso positions, the offensive of May, 1917, the taking of the Bainsizza Plateau three months later, the terrible business of Caporetto on October 24th-25th, 1917, and subsequent events:—

“To me the thing that needs explaining is not why the Retreat occurred, but why it did not occur long before, and how the Italian army and nation rallied and reconstituted their *moral*, and imposed upon themselves a new and better discipline. . . . The Italians are magnificent material, and if only they were given good education they would respond splendidly in peace as in war to the requirements of their age and their country.”

This is the note struck by the book, which realises to the full the magnificent promise of the New Italy now that her liberation is achieved, and should do much to forge anew the ties which have bound Italy and England in spiritual unity for so many centuries.

J. E. G. DE M.

* * *

HENRY BARCLAY SWETE.*

This “story of a quiet life, with its amazing industry and work accomplished,” should find many readers. Dr. Swete was an exemplar to his age in character, industry, thoroughness, and learning. Henry Barclay Swete was born at Redland, Bristol, on March 14th, 1835, the only child of the second marriage of Dr. John Swete. His mother was Caroline Ann Skinner Barclay, who died of consumption when but twenty-two, only a little older than her step-daughter Anne Swete, who became the child’s second mother. The third wife of Dr. Swete proved a repressing influence; a cousin of Caroline’s, she did not possess her “gentle, lovable character.” The boy “did not have a happy childhood” for Anne was a permanent invalid, and there were no playfellows. Henry was educated by his father and Anne, and was fortunate in his teachers, for Dr. Swete, a private schoolmaster, “had all the scholar’s love of accuracy and thoroughness; and this he combined with a clear mind and style, and the gift of stimulating his pupils, and of making scholars of them. Dean Church and his own son are evidence of his power as a teacher.” When Henry was fifteen his father accepted a country parish in the Mendips, and here the boy learned to love the country and gardening from his father, who taught him also the joys of a chamber-organ. This love of nature and music formed the great background of his life.

The boy was at King’s College, London, from 1852 to 1854, and then, despite his longing for Oxford, he was sent to Caius College, Cambridge. He was seventh in the Classical Tripos of 1858, and at once became a fellow of his college. He has left an interesting account of the formalities of admission in the college chapel. This was one of Shilleto’s great years. The first seven men in the Tripos

* *Henry Barclay Swete, D.D., F.B.A.* Sometime Regius Professor of Divinity, Cambridge: A Remembrance. (Macmillan. 6s. net.)

were all his pupils, and he had a characteristic rejoicing. Swete was ordained in the same year and became a deacon in his father's parish where he did much mission work among the Mendip miners. In 1865 he returned to Cambridge as Dean of his College, to his father's great regret. As Dean he was not a successful disciplinarian, but all the same his character and quiet influence told. After two years he had a long holiday for health in Egypt, and another period as curate, and in 1872 became College Tutor, and again failed as a college officer. From 1877 to 1890 he held the college living of Ashdon.

"His life as Rector of Ashdon was systematically ordered on the two-fold basis of literary and parochial work. His literary activity during the thirteen years of his incumbency covered his edition of Theodore of Mopsuetia's *Commentary on St. Paul*, 1880-2; contributions to the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, 1882-87; the first volume of his edition of the *Septuagint*, which was published in 1887, and the greater part of the second volume, which was completed in 1891; while from 1882-1890 he was Professor of Pastoral Theology at King's College, London. He was Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of St. Alban's, 1881-1890."

Despite his enormous labours, which were regarded as so important that the University Press helped to provide a curate for his parish, and so gave him more leisure for his Septuagint work, he found time thoroughly to organise his services. Perhaps his character is best exhibited by two instances. He was a purist in architectural matters, yet he left a hideous gallery standing because the working men of the parish liked it and used it. He was a High Churchman, but he took care that the "mid-day celebration was severely plain." One has only to compare this with the somewhat common practice (since "the Mission") of imposing in country parishes "the Mass" on a rural population which had been always used to slow, straightforward, simple, plain services. Dr. Swete saw the danger of this un-Christian fanaticism (which has injured the Church) and carefully avoided it. Moreover, he took infinite pains with his sermons and avoided the two extremes of discourses preached at high speed with mechanical accuracy so common in the advanced services of to-day, or of casual addresses. With Dr. Swete "the unlearned countryfolk could follow and understand; while behind all his simplicity of expression lay the knowledge and exactitude of the theologian." He was an assiduous visitor of his flock, a virtue, too, which needs imitation by the country clergy of to-day. But Dr. Swete was not really a social worker in a modern sense. He had not the gift of government, whether in his college or in his East Anglian village. He "spoilt his flock by doing everything for them." He was at heart essentially a professor, and when he succeeded Dr. Westcott in 1890 as Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge he was the right man in the right place at last, though many people thought at the time that it was a very doubtful appointment. Five and twenty years of service proved that the judgment of the Council of the Senate had been right. His professorship, says Bishop Chase, "stands out as a

great professorship, justly memorable, and fruitful of the highest good; and he himself gradually gained an almost unique influence over the undergraduates, who crowded his lecture room, and over a very wide circle of students of theology."

He was a great and continuous worker despite much bad health. The results of eight to nine hours' steady work every day are written in the history of modern theology. And his travels in Asia Minor helped his work. His collection of MSS. he gave to his college, and on his death on May 10th, 1917, the best of his books passed also to Caius. He died at Hitchin, whither he had retired in 1915 with his niece and her husband, the Bishop of Gibraltar. He had attained a great age, and out of the peculiar gentleness and quietude of his sixty years of work, he had given to the world the amazing list of publications mentioned in this book, and so far as theology is concerned, analysed in the chapter on his "Contribution to Theological Learning." That contribution consisted not only in the works of his pen but in his power of bringing other workers into the field.

"He was an assiduous propagandist by precept and example, by lectures and books, and by all the institutions which he founded, of patient, thorough, and independent study of all the sources of theological service, and the *data* on which it is built up. Only the great judgments of the Church on matters of faith were sacrosanct to him; of the processes by which they were reached, and the arguments by which they were supported, every student was entitled to judge for himself. The whole sphere of the history of the development of Christian thought and institutions was open to free and frank examination with no prescribed conclusions. . . . It was characteristic of Dr. Swete that, always while steadily working himself, he was at the same time always devising schemes for getting others to work. He was in this respect an ideal teacher and head of a great University faculty. He did his work so quietly and persistently, and kept himself so much in the background, that even the academic public scarcely realised its volume."

Quietude and persistence were part of this great scholar's character as well as of his work, and his influence is likely to persist in the great Cambridge faculty of theology in a fashion that other faculties might envy.

* * *

ENGLISH LITURGICAL COLOURS.*

The subject of liturgical colours is one of curious and almost mystical interest, and it is strange that it is only within the last sixty years that it has attracted much attention or indeed any scholarly interest in England. This majestic book, with its exquisite frontispiece reproducing in colours a Flemish fifteenth century illumination from a French manuscript book of Hours in the British

* *English Liturgical Colours*. By Sir Wm. St. John Hope, Litt.D., Hon. D.C.L. Durham, and E. G. Cuthbert F. Atchley, L.R.C.P. Lond., M.R.C.S. Eng, With coloured frontispiece. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. 25s. net.

Museum, brings together all the learning on the subject that has been gathered by Dr. J. Wickham Legg, Sir William Hope, the Rev. A. S. Barnes, and Mr. E. G. Cuthbert Atchley. The preface gives a useful introduction to the subject:—

“As soon as churches began to acquire more vestments than a set for everyday use, a second set for Sundays, and a best set for festivals, it was natural that different colours should be appropriated to the various festivals and several classes of saints, and the choice of the colour was determined in each country in Western Europe by the prevailing ideas of fitness. In point of fact, however, there was a fairly general unanimity in the schemes which developed everywhere outside the Roman diocese, while within that a scheme of another type gradually took shape. . . . It is now possible to give the colour or colours actually used for almost every day in the Kalendar. There is no longer any ground for stating that the English use of colours is unknown, nor for the old idea that the colour-use in this country was confused and varied in almost every church. On the contrary, as will be seen from these pages, a scheme of colour usage gradually grew up which in its main lines was the same all over England, and even in Scotland: the local variations for the most part being on well-defined lines, and not in any case of importance as regards the whole.”

These authors have gone for their rules as to the use of liturgical colours to be recorded practice of certain great churches, to references in ecclesiastical inventories, and to “bequests of vestments and altar furniture for special purposes or occasions of use.” Of course, actual local use depended on the means of a church. A poor church had to do the best it could. The fact is illustrated by many examples in this volume relating to the thirteenth century. Only one church, Walton, had a cope of silk, while at Aldbury there was a complete suit “but with a chasuble old and torn and only fit to bury a priest in (*sed sepulture tantum apta*); also a better vestment with a chasuble of silk cloth.” The general evidence shows that “in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, at any rate, no colour rule could have been observed, in either town or country parishes, owing to the comparative fewness of their vestments and altar hangings.” At the end of the thirteenth century as vestments multiplied, we find them graded according to richness and condition into festal, Sunday, and serial (working) suits without regard to colour. In the fourteenth century we find a slight preponderance of red for feast days and white (or old cloth of gold) for week days. There was no Sunday colour.

By the mid-fifteenth century “most of the parishes had. . . . acquired, five, six, or even more suits of vestments, and one or two copes, the colours of which are usually given.” But colour was not really important in the fifteenth century, “and this, too, at a time when the wealth of the English churches called forth the admiration of a Venetian gentleman attached to an Embassy from that State in 1496.” Indeed, down to the Reformation “condition and material primarily were deemed more important than the colour of a vestment.” But wills and inventories give us some information as to seasons and special days. The inventories are

practically unanimous in showing that throughout England the colour for Lent was white after the middle of the fourteenth century. "So far as the rules are concerned the Sarum Lenten colour, at any rate on Sundays, seems to have been *red*; the thirteenth century Lichfield rule orders *black*; and that of Westminster *black* or *quasi-black*. In the fourteenth century Ash Wednesday was *red* at Salisbury and Pleshy, but at Exeter the Lenten colour was *violet*, and at Wells apparently *blue*." But in Lent, from at any rate the eleventh century, all pictures, images and reredoses were covered with sheeting, or linen cloths until (in England) after compline on Easter even. Lenten veils for the most part were white, but various other colours occur and some were very beautiful, as the veil at Exeter described by its bishop as *pulcrum et nobile*. "It is very possible that the same Judaising influence, which apparently produced the Lenten veils and altar riddels, in distant imitation of the Mosaic curtains of the Tabernacle, may be responsible for the white vestments, and that these were suggested by the *vestes albæ* of the high priest on the day of atonement. . . . Examples of white Lenten vestments and frontals, extending over two centuries, are to be found in every English diocese." The Lenten vestments were for the most part plain white, "but they were often sown or powdered with crosses, roses, or spots of red, or other symbols of the Passion." These white vestments were apparently worn in a certain number of cases on Sundays as well as week days in Lent. In Passiontide the universal colour seems to have been red, both in practice and in the rules. "The Good Friday colour was undoubtedly *red* all over England," with some very few exceptions. There is little evidence as to the colour to be used at Easter, but certainly the best vestments were used and in many cases a small green banner was added to the processional cross. There is some evidence for white and green as the Easter colour for vestments and white was universal for Ascensiontide with the rarest exceptions. Green was a Whitsun colour, as also were red and gold. White was usual for feasts or commemorations of the Virgin Mary and the same colour for other feasts of virgins who were not martyrs. "The colours for Confessors, both in the rules and the inventories, are *yellow*, *green*, *blue*, or *brown*, and the rules often give a choice of two or even three colours." At Eastertide and Christmastide there were colour sequences. The subject is full of interest. Can these authors explain the relation to these liturgical colours of the colours worn by the Judges of the Crown in different seasons in their robes. It is a point on which there appears to be some ignorance and perhaps difference of opinion.



SHORTER REVIEWS.

Biographies of our noblest citizens are perhaps the books which above all others have the greatest potentiality for good influence and charm; but, alas, many men there are whose splendid lives go unrecorded, and also good biographies are rare, as they present so many temptations

either to exaggeration or omission. That of Harold Tennyson, R.N. ("Harold Tennyson, R.N. : The Story of a Young Sailor, put together by a Friend," Macmillan & Co., Ltd., price 5s.), is, however, one of those which stands out as a marked exception to this tendency, because the basis of its information rests upon the surest of foundations, the letters of a devoted mother, and the letters of a good son to his mother. A beautiful picture they present to us of a type of the noblest of our race—a young English sailor, endowed with all the advantages ancestry, education, and surroundings could bestow, who has laid down his life for his country in the discharge of his duty. An uncommon and rare spirit must young Tennyson have possessed, one whose life was, as it were, to quote from Rupert Brooke, "to live poetry," a worthy descendant of his famous grandfather whose glory it was to write it. However, Harold also inherited the literary talent as well as the noble mind; quite as a small boy he used to indulge in verse, and we have an example in the book of a quaint little stanza dedicated to his mother. Lady Tennyson had a great influence upon his character and upbringing, and the sympathy between them is evident in the frankness and affection of their correspondence. The letters of the young man show direct bias towards writing, and some of his descriptions of events connected with the war—of the destruction of an aeroplane right over his boat, of the gale in the Bay, the very last letter before his death on the *Viking* from the explosion of a mine, giving an account of the bombardment of Dunquerque, display a remarkable power of language and observation. The letters, too, of Lady Tennyson are full of interest, not only from particulars about her son and his education, but from the information given of the life and work of the Governor-General and his family, coupled with delightful glimpses of Australian scenery and native customs. We could wish that the identity of the "Friend" who has put together the delightful correspondence, could have been revealed. We fancy that, from the discretion shown in the selection of letters, more especially of those from friends and officers expressing sympathy with Lord and Lady Tennyson in their loss, and from the power of some of the introductory matter, he is a writer of no mean literary position. For example, in the few introductory pages giving an idea of life at Farringford and in Australia, we get, in a few expressive lines, a concentrated glimpse of some of England's most cherished scenes and thoughts; and, as at the same time the passage seems to strike the keynote of the rest of the book, it ought to be quoted verbatim.

Portsmouth and Spithead, Ryde and Cowes, Southampton and Yarmouth, represent the story of England's national life and lordship of the sea, and all the different types of her naval, merchant, fishing, and pleasure craft. It was a daily experience for the child to see the 'ships of battle,' great or small, with which he was afterwards to be so familiar, passing on their various errands, or to watch the great mercantile liners taking up the pilot and 'crossing the bar' from the Solent out into the open ocean.

It was amid these surroundings that he took his earliest impressions. Born some three years and a-half after his illustrious grandfather passed away, unlike his eldest brother, born in 1889, who as a child of three had walked up the aisle of Westminster Abbey at his funeral, he had no remembrance of him. But some traits he had inherited, and his grandfather's poems were a great influence on his short life.

* * *

The "Romance of the Red Triangle" (Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton, price 6s.) has succeeded not only in giving an account of the splendid work of the Y.M.C.A., but also an impression of those great doings in France conveying the feeling of actuality; the Association, with its organ-

isations and members everywhere, yet detached from the actual work of fighting, has had a specially favourable opportunity for getting to learn the requisite facts. Although we all know in a general way of the magnificent accomplishment of the Y.M.C.A. in aiding the troops, yet the well chosen particulars furnished by Sir Arthur Yapp seem to clinch our recollection, and crystallise it upon some striking feature. For example, let us recall the first few days of the war; quartered in several small villages, there were thousands on Salisbury Plain with no uniforms, no rifles, nowhere to go, and nothing to do—England not having planned the war—until the Y.M.C.A. established one of its vast tents. However, the storms of the Wiltshire highlands made it clear that a stronger structure was needed, and the huts, with which we are now so familiar, were built to take the place of canvas, and gradually appeared, as we know, in every part of the world where British soldiers were sent. To give some idea of the number finally put up, nearly 120 were destroyed by the Hun in the partial break-through in March, 1918. However, the labour of the intrepid workers had to be carried out, often in improvised shelters at the times of rapid advance or retreat, and the Red Sign over some dug-out or recently occupied shanty within a few minutes of the most advanced lines was a source of marvel to many a foreign visitor. At Ypres, for example, between the “Cellar” and the enemy were nine of the Society’s dug-outs at advanced stations; one of them, the tenth, at the corner of the Lille Road—the “Cellar” referred to—for many months was the centre of the social life of the ruined town, though large meetings, of course, were impossible. Perhaps some of the most striking work of the Y.M.C.A. has been their attention to the “walking wounded,” and many a life must have been spared to the country by the timely restoratives supplied to these men on their slow progress back from the front. Often the Y.M.C.A. helpers, in times of retreat, would wait at the hut while shells were bursting round them, till, even in some cases, the advancing Germans were actually visible. Sir Arthur Yapp gives the reader a wonderful opportunity to visualise some of the scenes of the war—such as, for example, the desolation of a ruined town, or the effect on the spectator of the creeping barrage, while numerous quaint or pathetic little incidents, crisply told, serve to make the whole easy and delightful reading. One may perhaps be quoted verbatim:—“The wounded (from Paaschendaale) were being brought in on stretchers, and he (a secretary) was on the spot with hot drinks for the boys. The guns were quiet for a moment, and a voice was heard singing clearly and distinctly:—

“Lead, Kindly Light, amid the encircling gloom
Lead Thou me on”

(right through the verse). The singer was a private, badly wounded, and being carried on a stretcher. The subsequent verses were drowned in the roar of battle, but those standing round could see from the movement of the man’s lips that he was still singing.” There are other stories of all kinds, grave and gay, which everyone should read.

* * *

Sir James W. Barrett, in “The War Work of the Y.M.C.A. in Egypt” (H. K. Lewis & Co., Ltd., 136, Gower Street, W.C. 1. 10s. 6d. net), shows what a remarkable work the Y.M.C.A. has done in Egypt during the war. “Before the war I only knew of the Y.M.C.A. as a comparatively small organisation in Australia, which provided not very

pretentious clubs for the use of its members, which was administered by some public-spirited citizens, and which appeared to my uninformed judgment simply to represent an additional sectarian movement." In Egypt the Y.M.C.A. co-operated with the Australian Red Cross, the latter finding the money and the former doing the work. Sir James Barrett was familiar with the work from January, 1915, to the end with the exception of five months—November, 1915, to March, 1916—when he was invalided to England. So he gives us a picture of the work, a living account of the social and, at the same time, essentially religious work carried on at the Dardanelles, in the Soudan, in the desert as well as in Egypt proper. General Allenby in his preface writes: "No one has more reason than I to be grateful to the Y.M.C.A. for its work in connection with the army. Throughout the campaign its workers have followed closely the fighting line, and their labours have done much to keep up the moral, mental, and physical efficiency of my troops. . . . This book is of absorbing interest, and the reader is filled with admiration and gratitude towards the organisers and administrators of this vast undertaking. Broad-minded Christianity, self-regardless devotion to work, a spirit of daring enterprise and sound business guidance, have built up an organisation which has earned the gratitude of the Empire." Such words from the General Commanding in Chief the Egyptian Expeditionary Force are indeed commendation. The Y.M.C.A. needs money for its world-wide work to-day. It should have little difficulty in securing it.

* * *

The chief value in the production, for the benefit of the general public, of "*Bye-ways of Study*" (Messrs. T. Fisher Unwin & Co., price 4s. 6d. net), by Mr. Darrell Figgis, would seem to be the same that he claims for the letters of Meredith—namely, a further introduction to the mind of the writer, which in this case seems to be of much interest from its poetic fervour and racial enthusiasm. The practical outcome seems not so great. Of the four very divers themes, the first essay (written in justification of the late Mr. C. S. Parnell) seems to lose its importance as solid argument from the tacit admission by Mr. Figgis that Mr. Parnell's summing up of every man's personality in the words "What I am I am, what I am not I cannot be," is a true estimate of the possibilities of human character. With this doctrine of egoism as a guiding star, attempts to appreciate such different people as Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Chamberlain, and Cardinal Manning, and the motives that might actuate them in dealing with a man such as Mr. Parnell, would seem to fall to the ground. The other political essay of the volume is very interesting from the publication of a fresh document setting forth the enlightened Irish policy of the famous Earl of Tyrone in Elizabeth's reign, which doubtless would have done much to establish peace and prosperity for Ireland if he could have got his countrymen to agree to it. Of the two literary essays, that upon George Meredith seems to us much the more informative, and written with high appreciation of the author's talent. That about Francis Thompson suffers from the very exuberance of Mr. Figgis's own poetic style. For example, consider, on p. 25, such a sentence as "the dreams he had dreamed when the hardest pang whereon he laid his mutinous head was indeed a Jacob's stone, burst into flower of song when the arches of Covent Garden were exchanged for the peace of Storrington." Or p. 40, "If the 'Hound of Heaven' (in valueless literary appraising) be wilder in its appeal, swifter and more various of tumult, at least the two poems have a significant relation each to the

other." Many of us, in reading Francis Thompson, may have sometimes a little difficulty in realising his exact meaning, and such explanations hardly help us. The above is, moreover, the only allusion to the "Hound of Heaven."

* * *

Miss Eileen Power, the director of Studies in History at Girton, has edited a useful "Bibliography for Teachers of History" (Women's Historical League, 14, Bedford-row, W.C. 1., 2s. net), to which Lord Buckmaster has contributed a foreword, and Miss Eleanor Doorly, headmistress of the County School, Twickenham, an introductory essay. Lord Buckmaster feels that true history lies behind the *phantasmagoria* of Empires and the Babylons of successive ages, though surely these organic manifestations should not be neglected. Behind these we have "the true drama of the world, the lives and fates of the millions of humble people, struggling to build and keep their homes, fighting against famine and disease, and wrestling, unaided, in unending conflict with forces they but dimly understand. History should reveal to the ignorant these forces, the ideals and goal towards which they move amid the struggle upwards of the principles of righteousness." This bibliography is prepared in order that teachers may help their pupils to understand these things. Miss Doorly pleads for "new history"; a history for school use, which, if we understand her point of view, should be essentially truthful and well proportioned, bringing out the processes of principles rather than the recording of interesting events. We cannot agree that the results of Crécy "are all worn away from the deep-furrowed face of the nations": that is a dangerous type of argument. What is needed is proportion and vitality. For that reason it is a little surprising that no book on the history of education is mentioned (other than the late Miss Elizabeth Godfrey's charming volume on "English Children in the Olden Times"). It is curious to note that Mr. J. R. Green almost entirely neglected this vital subject. Many of the books on world history, English social and economic history, British Overseas Dominions and citizenship, patriotism, and also nationalism, contained in the lists, are the latest books, and are not always well-tested; but on the whole the selections are good and should give life to history teaching in schools.



NOTICES OF BOOKS.

In "Greece before the Conference" (Methuen. 5s. net) we have, from the pen of "Polybius," whom we are assured on the book cover is "an authority on Near Eastern affairs," a statement of the Greek case now before the Paris Conference. Mr. T. P. O'Connor in his preface expresses resentment at the thought that "it should still be necessary for anyone to say a word in defence" of the Greek claims "to remain Greek, to govern themselves, to return to their unity." Mr. O'Connor feels that "if to-day Europe remains European, and not Asiatic, it has been because Greece has been—along with Armenia—Europe's sentinel at the portal that stands between Europe and Asia." Certainly the Eastern Empire saved Europe through the Dark Ages, though it is hardly

fair to classify that Empire as only Greek. The Roman tradition was the force that achieved such success for a thousand years after the dissolution of the Western Empire. But the Greek has certainly never abandoned his ideals, and he has kept his classical tongue alive not only in the schools but in the home and the market place. The Greeks demand, according to Mr. O'Connor, *all* the Greek Isles, including isles demanded by Italy and also our Cyprus; Thrace, which is a Grecian not Bulgarian land; Northern Epirus with the exception of the purely Albanian districts; Constantinople if possible; the western littoral of Asia Minor, which has been held by Greeks "almost as long as Greece had historic existence. Long before the Christian era, Smyrna was a Greek city; it has, indeed, been a Greek city for three thousand years." Mr. O'Connor claims that the representations of the great democracies of France, the United States, and England at the Conference must stand for the claims of Greece. "Polybius" looks presently for a Balkan League between Greece, Serbia, and Roumania, which will find a place for Albania. Can Bulgaria be left out of this League if permanent peace is in view?

* * *

Mr. Norman Roe has done well in picking up the threads of his pre-war verse and giving the world this charming little volume entitled "Sonnets of Old Things and Other Verses" (*Daily Post* printers, Wood-street, Liverpool, 3s. 6d. net). If we were tempted to be critical we should say that Mr. Roe is a little inclined to preciousness and hardly gives himself elbow room. Certainly, and it is not critical to say this, he is one of the Browning school which is at last coming into being. Browning wrote only one or two sonnets so that there is nothing imitative in the work which shows the Browning spirit and his acute sense of historic perspective. This is plain enough in the fine sonnets on "An Old Roman Coin," "An Old Rush-light Holder," "A Little Jade Goddess," "An Old Play Bill." But Mr. Roe is simpler and perhaps more charming, in his "Other Verses." "The Rose Garden" is excellent, but best of all is his *Rondeau* :—

"A lark trills sweetest in the sky,
A dove looks whiter on the wing,
And caged love will surely die,
For love is such a frightened thing."

* * *

Mr. Carl van Doren has done useful work in selecting and editing, with an introduction, "Tales by Washington Irving" (Oxford University Press. 3s. 6d. net). Here again are "Rip van Winkle," "The Legend of Sleepy Hollow," Stories from "Bracebridge Hall," many tales from "Tales of a Traveller," and many of the delightful "Alhambra" sketches. It is rather sad to think that it has been found necessary to have "spelling and punctuation slightly modernised." That process has gone on with Shakespeare for three centuries, and presumably it must happen to all popular authors if successive generations are to read them. Yet Chaucer is better in his fourteenth century dress, and we could bear with the original Washington Irving a little longer. He is a delightful author with a gracious style full of latent humour and pleasant sentiment. He is the counterpart of Thomas Moore in prose, but is likely to live much longer. His Moorish tales give a sense of illusion rare in literature, and this is indeed true of all his work.

OUR FINANCIAL PLIGHT.

THE war has stunned us by its awful calamities, and its unexpected barbarities, and by the bereavement which desolated our households. Nothing matters much in comparison with these events of destruction and death. What is money or the finance of persons and business houses in comparison with the loss of a generation of our young men? Life and money cannot be weighed in the same balance. Even the suddenness of the Armistice seemed to take away the breath of men who in times of peace were alert and ready to express their reflections and warnings. Nothing less than these fundamental influences can account for the placid temper in which Great Britain surveys its financial condition and prospects. Do we even survey it? The Chancellor of the Exchequer has his Budget day and gives Parliament two hours of descriptive eloquence, and some few premonitions, adorned by an offering to his father's memory. The newspapers say that the figures are so large as to be past the grasp of the ordinary brain, which is true enough, and then with some outbursts on the cost of beer and whisky, and a passing sneer at the millionaires whose estates are to bear heavier death duties, public attention is diverted to more interesting and cheerful topics. If that is really the condition of the political atmosphere, we shall make a short journey to financial disaster.

The National Debt cannot be ignored; it hangs over the whole country, menacing beyond measure. When war broke out it was heavy, standing at £645,000,000, but it caused us no industrial or fiscal discomfort. In March, 1918, it had reached £5,872,000,000. That was staggering, and men with a turn for figures in town and country made many calculations of the interest this and future generations would have to find. No forecasts can be reliable, and if you were sanguine you dismissed the forebodings with the thought that values have been altered, the national income is bigger than ever it was, and, as a final encouragement, other countries are poorer than we are. If you were a plain business man ready to confront figures without any dodges for obscuring their arithmetical purport, you foresaw an annual debt charge, not to be evaded by any means short of direct or indirect repudiation, of the stupendous total of well over £290,000,000. That was bad enough. Now we are worse off. In twelve months the Debt has gone up by another £1,563,000,000, and the prospective debt charge will for the future be over £370,000,000. Are we indeed so dazed by the war and its smashing blows and no less dramatic end that we are unable to understand what these gigantic millions mean?

Even when full allowance is made for part of this burden being borne by the Allies and Dominions, who owe us £1,739,000,000, the totals outstrip the ordinary imagination. We must not count on repayment from Russia for many a long year. What is to be repaid by France, Italy, Roumania, Jugo-Slavia, Greece, and Belgium will be the subjects of discussion and negotiation at many inter-Allied Conferences, and it will be as well for us to realise our burden in its gross form rather than comfort ourselves at present

with problematical recoupments. Other belligerent countries are worse off than we are, and will be less ready to carry their load. The obligations of the Allies to us are clear, and we should not waive them, but our own provision will be more prudent if it regards returns whenever they come from our European colleagues as found money. Some writers encourage themselves with the hope that the rate of interest will fall. It will not fall until borrowing is stopped. It cannot fall until current charges, including debt charges, are met out of current revenue, and some years of these healthier balance-sheets will have to pass before the rate of interest is influenced. Even then a great increase in the productivity of our industry and commerce must have been secured, and been so well established as to turn the financial tendency in the right direction. Whether this will show itself in twelve or twenty or thirty years no authority can prophesy now, although we are all conscious of the immense strain to be placed on British perseverance for at least two generations. I have not credited the United Kingdom with any portion of the German indemnity for National Debt purposes. Germany has to pay for reparation, and that will absorb thousands of millions. If after that is paid the persons who promised the British electorate last December our full share of the useful £24,000,000,000, secure for our Exchequer the sums which they are pledged to extract from Germany, so much the better for our Chancellor and his groaning taxpayers. In any case we shall not forget the promise of £24,000,000,000, but we shall be doubly fools if we build on that corner-stone of political strategy.

Meantime, Mr. Chamberlain calls to our aid sales of stores and materials of war not now necessary, called euphemistically salvage. The Departments will themselves get £280,000,000 by this means, and by special sales a further £200,000,000 will be raised. All the goods sold in these salvage operations were paid for out of loans, except, say, one-fourth provided by taxation, but the produce of the sales will not go to repay loans. It will all be counted as current revenue; and it will not recur. Only by these means does he make his post-armistice budget show a deficit of £233,000,000. The deficit is really £480,000,000 worse than this. He has to borrow in the current year nearly £5,000,000 a week. While this goes on, there can be no substantial easing of prices and no tendency towards a reduction of interest. If in pre-war days the Government had been forced to borrow this sum the City would have been alarmed, every bank would have protested against such a serious blow at the gilt-edged market, and assets would have been written down by prudent houses to meet the fall such an issue would inflict on securities. What was serious then is heard of now with a sigh of relief or a shrug of indifference, and yet in those days Government borrowing of £233,000,000 was not so grave as borrowing now after we have exhausted our credit by loans raised during the war of £6,790,000,000.

The Budget details are well known, and the changes in the scale of taxes are understood by that part of the public which follows the events of the day. Beer and spirits are to yield more, the death duties are to be made steeper, and the excess profits duty is to be

reduced. Income-tax and super-tax remain where they were. Contrary to every canon of sound finance, the Chancellor is to give away £3,000,000 a year as a tribute to the political idea of imperial preference. He cannot afford it, and his only justifications for it at this time are found in his appeal to Mr. Joseph Chamberlain's crusade of twelve years ago, and in his description of the proposal as "small beginnings." It will please some firms in the Dominions, and some clever firms at home. These benefits paid for by the consumers or taxpayers as a whole will go to a comparatively small number of individuals who deserve no more from us than do any other persons in the Empire. The Budget can be summed up in these striking figures:—

1919-20 Expenditure	£1,434,910,000
Revenue on basis of existing taxation	£1,159,650,000
Deficit on that basis	£275,260,000
Deficit after new concessions	£342,000,000
Yield of new or additional taxation	£109,000,000
Deficit to add to National Debt	£233,000,000

Mr. Chamberlain was not as crude as his predecessor in constructing for us a "normal" budget. He made his prophecies cautiously. "Neither this year, nor next year, nor perhaps the year after will be entirely normal, and in considering what our policy ought to be, I am driven to the hazardous experiment of casting my mind forward into the future to an imaginary normal year." There will be no normal year in our lifetime. The war expenditure has made a normal year impossible for at least a generation.

"What does this matter to us?" says the working man. I am stating the unpleasant truth when I say that the money burdens of the State and the method by which we make or fail to make ends meet matters more to the poorer classes and to the working man than to the capitalists. The latter are to receive a high rate for their capital, so long as debt stands at to-day's stupendous heights. The high rate of interest is the measure of the power of free capital to secure its share in the produce of industry. Risks and insecurity will affect capital, and for these the rest of mankind will have to pay in high rates of interest. By many men of bold thought this is believed to be intolerable, but whether we like or hate it the fact is unavoidable. If we are to reduce the power of capital and the tribute it draws from our people, we must make national revenue exceed national expenditure and repay with all speed our great borrowings. Croesus will profit by the nation's needs, and Demos will suffer.

Let me put these sufferings in their simplest form. Everyone is paying high prices for what he has to buy. Food, clothing, houses, all cost more than we each in our own way think we can afford to pay. Two causes make for high prices—namely, scarcity, and inflation of currency and credit. Scarcity may pass away, provided import prohibitions are wiped out and are not preserved by weak Departments under the influence and guidance of interested trades and individuals. To maintain artificial scarcity in these times is

the policy of the enemies of Demos. A free country expressing itself through a free House of Commons would not stand for a week the nonsense of "Dora" or Customs Acts restrictions on our supplies. Great Britain is awakening to realise the network of dodgery and narrow greed which is being woven round our ports; and scarcity in due course will probably pass away. Inflation of currency and credit will remain.

We are not the only sinners. Russia probably made more paper money during the past twelve months than was ever struck off by printing presses in all the sad history of war. The whole belligerent world has in one way or another inflated its currency or swollen its credit without creating wealth to correspond to the expanded credit. That is the way of all countries and governments in time of war. If money is made more abundant while the quantity of goods in the world is not increased and may even be diminished, money becomes cheaper and goods become dearer. If the deflation of the currency and of credit is not undertaken, prices will be kept up permanently. If borrowing be necessary, then the State should borrow from real lenders, real wealth and not bank created credit. To borrow from one's bank in order to lend to the Government is to take part in the well-nigh universal sin of inflating credit. These are elementary doctrines which I may be forgiven for repeating, because they apply with force to Mr. Chamberlain's finance. The Treasury at least three years ago abandoned all hope of accumulating behind their issues of pound and ten-shilling notes an equivalent amount of gold, and the currency was diluted by hundreds of millions of notes. There was reason to hope that the note issue would be reduced when hostilities ceased. Such a step would have contributed to the lowering of prices nearer to normal levels and real values. It was with a shock that we read in the Parliamentary reports the announcement that since the Armistice the Treasury has added to the note issue no less than £58,000,000. Nor is that the whole story. Lending to the Government was not so clearly a duty for the average citizen when hostilities came to an end, and the Chancellor found himself short in many weeks of money with which to meet his obligations. Taxation and continuous borrowing in the country were insufficient, and he had to resort to the Bank of England to make up the lacking sums. What he got thus in Threadneedle Street was under the heading of Ways and Means advances, which being interpreted means borrowing by inflating the sum-total of credit. This policy supports high prices—it does more, it puffs them up still higher. Unsound finance led the Government into these devices; these devices in their turn struck at the consumer. By high prices, artificially inflated, supported by exploiters, everyone is made to feel the direct bearing of our financial troubles on the common man. Additions to the value of capital have to be paid for sooner or later by everyone. The absorption of vast sums of money in warfare starves industry of the very capital without which it cannot expand; and in the absence of industrial activity more and more households will be deprived of their means of livelihood. For these and other reasons we are justified in saying that honesty, courage, and

soundness in national finance concern not only the rich but the poor, not only the financiers but the nation in every grade and class. Those who are least conscious of these big problems are often the classes to suffer most by the lack of public interest in and public influence on the money matters of the State.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer will be bound sooner or later to push his revenue up by the only productive means—namely, by additions to the income-tax in one form or another. If he had put it up by sixpence or a shilling he would have brought home to the spending classes the gravity of our position. There would on Budget day have been fewer smiling faces, and more men grasping the true facts. Lulled into a sense of false prosperity the general public will never provide for the Minister the force necessary to keep his extravagant colleagues within reasonable bounds. When, moreover, all the ingenuity of practical or theoretical taxers is exhausted, the Government will be driven back to one means and only one means of balancing their sheet—they will have to cut down expenditure. Therein lies our only hope. No swollen-headed Minister can be tolerated at the War Offices or the Ministry of Supply or in the countless civil departments. In order that we may be saved from national poverty and repudiation in any form and impotence in the world's competition for industrial employment, we shall have to call to our aid a ministry which from top to bottom hates extravagance and is united as one man to stamp out every item, large or small, of the endless entries in our national cash-books, which takes a penny or a pound or a thousand or a million out of the exchequer except on the unanswerable plea of necessity for existence. A financial cabinet is essential, selected with the prime object of restoring rigid economy in conjunction with sound finance, to set our money matters straight, just as a War Cabinet was supposed to be devoted to the single object of winning the war—a finance Cabinet with our greatest living financier at its head; that is the foremost necessity of our time. Let the plain facts of our financial plight be made clear to the people, and half the battle will be won in the campaign for increased production. If the full tale is told, men and industries will understand that they must each and all pull their weight, take their full share in the work of creating wealth and earning a livelihood honestly.

I have purposely avoided any discussion of the rival theories of money and prices, or of the financial relations of America and the United Kingdom, or of the necessity for a natural American sterling exchange and the influence of an unpegged exchange on our exports and imports. And we need not bother ourselves seriously about Paris economic resolutions of 1916, which have no practical bearing on Mr. Chamberlain's budget and were out of date on the defeat of the Central Empires. These topics may be interesting and some of them are of profound-importance, but I content myself at present with a statement of the main outlines of the bare facts, which stupified or light-hearted sections of our people whether in high places or humble are inclined to ignore. My main plea is that no time should be lost in concentrating on these dominating financial tasks the best financial brains of Great Britain.

WALTER RUNCIMAN.

PROSPECTS IN RUSSIA.

A GREY dawn is setting in over Russia after a long spell of darkness. There was a time when a great Tsar might have gathered all the nations of his Empire around him in the struggle for freedom and justice, but a weak and misguided Tsar squandered the treasure of popular trust which was at his disposal in the opening of the War. There was a time when a coalition between patriotic socialists like Kerensky and patriotic military leaders like Korniloff might have prevented the shameful disruption of the State, but Kerensky and Korniloff fought one another for the benefit of fanatical adventurers. Indeed, the history of Russia during these last years reminds one of the legend of the Sibyl, who offered to sell her book of prophecy to the Roman authorities. They declined the offer because of the high price. After great disasters the Sibyl appeared again with half the pages torn out, and yet asked the same price for the remnant. Her offer was again rejected; when she came a third time there was only one leaf of the prophetic text left, but the price was the same.

Even so in Russia—it is not victory nor glorious regeneration that her statesmen have to bid for now, but existence, the re-establishment of the bare foundations of political life. But even in this task it is not enough to discover the right course: the people must find strength to steer such a course.

The summer will, let us hope, decide the downfall of the criminal gang which has brought ruin to the country. The object lessons of the Bolshevik experiments are bringing enlightenment to the most obdurate experimentalists. Advanced students in Marxian economics have begun to realise that a country cannot live without exchange, transport and credit, as a human being cannot live without circulation. Industrial workmen are coming to the conclusion that it is not in their interest to revert to natural husbandry; peasants have learnt that it is not enough to seize the land of the neighbouring squires, that bread comes from the distant South to the North and boots come from the distant North to the South. Nor can the paradox of an army led by terrorised officers be upheld much longer. Bolshevism is dying, but who is to bury it and to succeed to its ruined estate?

A military dictatorship is a necessary stage, but only a transitional stage. All the leaders have declared emphatically that they want to liberate Russia, and not to enslave it. Besides, as Napoleon said long ago, one can conquer with bayonets, but not sit on bayonets. There are some generals and officers in Russia whose range of political vision does not extend further than to the establishment of a military dictatorship. But shortsighted cynicism would merely create another entanglement, and delay the development of the main action for some time without preventing the ultimate settlement. It is not only the personal integrity of men like Koltchak and Denikin that vouches for it, but the dominant tendencies of their surroundings. Not one of the leading men in Omsk, in Ekaterinodar, in Archangel, in Paris, represents reaction

in the sense of a return to the old *régime*. Sazonoff and Maklakoff as well as Savinkoff, Astroff, &c., are convinced reformers, though they have ceased to be doctrinaires. It is clear to all thinking patriots that it would be fatal to fall back under the sway of a political system which has produced the monster of Bolshevism with its ideal of self-destructive hatred.

The real danger to be faced is the immense difficulty of erecting a solid structure on the ruins of old Russia. In its simplest form the difficulty will face the Constituent Assembly which must meet sooner or later to reconstruct the State. Is New Russia to be a Monarchy or a Republic? There is a question, which, though put in general terms, points to a series of other knotty problems.

Monarchy can be neither created nor rejected at will. Monarchy certainly appeals to the inarticulate feelings of the people as the embodiment of the State in a living person. The heathens gave their gods human shapes, because the human form helped them to approach the forces of nature; even so elemental "*demos*" is inclined to personify power. But the monarchical myth does not arise at random. It wants a peculiar soil for its growth—the soil of more or less successful historical achievements. There may be monarchical feeling still alive in the consciousness of the people. The work of Peter the Great, of Catherine, of Alexander I, of Alexander II, had formed a capital which it was not easy to squander. But the last generations of the Romanoffs have done everything possible to desecrate traditional authority. The humiliations of the Berlin Congress and of the Japanese War, the experiences of the wretched "Kids" armed with sticks and sent to the trenches to face Mackensen's machine guns, the insolent corruption of Rasputin, prepared the revolution in people's minds, and there are no personalities among the surviving scions of the old dynasty capable of inspiring the nation with renewed confidence.

The question of a possible attempt to revive a monarchy on a different dynastic basis remains open, but it would be useless to speculate on the chances of such an adventure. I should like merely to remark that the events of 1613 when the Romanoffs, an aristocratic family of second rank, were raised to the throne formerly occupied by descendants of Rurik, cannot be regarded as a historical precedent in this connection. This act of the reconstitution of Russia was a natural one in the atmosphere of three hundred years ago. In the political thought of the people there existed no other mould of government except that of Tsardom. All the usurpers and pretenders of the Troubled Times set up claims to that title and power. Needless to add, the range of possible combinations has been substantially extended since then: even in the darkest corners of the country they know now that there are other means of governing the State. The notion of a Commonwealth is by no means unfamiliar or repugnant to the people, while, on the other hand, no claim as to Monarchical succession would remain unchallenged or could be put forward with any measure of traditional authority. The political education of the Russian nation has been slow, and in some respects it

has taken an unfavourable turn, but three hundred years have not passed without leaving their mark on political consciousness.

Another form of monarchical settlement is, however, more than a subject for fanciful speculation. I mean an attempt to turn the military dictatorship arising out of the death struggle with Bolshevism into a permanent Empire on the Napoleonic pattern. Such an eventuality is not to be ruled out as fanciful or substantially improbable. The disillusionment as regards liberal theories, the craving for rest and order, the demand for retaliation and punishment which is sure to follow the collapse of the Bolsheviks will provide a good deal of material for a "counter-revolution," and the chief who succeeds in putting an end to the present trouble will naturally form the centre of political movements directed towards the restoration of personal government on Imperial lines. Let us, however, express the hope that the recoil in this direction will not result in irretrievable errors of judgment. An imperialistic counter-revolution would mean the re-opening of the fatal struggle between authority and freedom to which the present ruin of the country must be ascribed. Authority is a necessary element in the constitution of a State, but it would be the greatest misfortune if authority were set up in reconstructed Russia as the one and absolute principle of government. Authority has to be combined with law and justified by law, that is, by an order of rights, and no order of rights can be maintained if the life of the State depends ultimately on personal discretion.

The recognition of this interdependence between authority and right is the essence and the common trait of all Constitutions, and the wisdom of statesmen in civilised countries has consisted in ascertaining the conditions and proportions in which these two elements of stability have to be combined in particular cases. Any violation of this fundamental formula would give rise to continuous unrest and struggle, to a state of things similar to that prevailing in China or in Persia after the downfall of their traditional political systems. Apart from that, a counter-revolutionary Empire would find itself entirely out of touch with the general progress of democracy in the civilised world. There can be no doubt that many difficulties have been created for the cause of national reconstruction in Russia by the distrust of Western democratic opinion in regard to the aims and policy of the military leaders. Koltchak's *coup d'état* of Omsk may have been necessary from the point of view of the creation of an effective force and of an efficient administration, but it was a grievous set-back from the point of view of international co-operation, and future historians will probably examine very carefully the possibility of arranging a working compromise with the Anti-Bolshevik Socialists represented by Avkertiëff and his colleagues. The fact that these men, when displaced and banished, remained staunch in their denunciation of Lenin's tyranny shows at any rate that there was no lack of patriotism on their part, even if some of their views and measures may have been trammelled of rapid and decisive action. I am mentioning this rather antiquated episode only because it presents a warning against much more ambitious schemes in the

future. A permanent estrangement between reconstructed Russia and the progressive democracies of the West would be an irretrievable disaster for both sides. Russia, in any case, is bound to derive immense advantages from the support and good-will of the West: to steer a course leading into German harbours would be to steer towards enslavement. According to the parable in the Gospel nothing is to be more dreaded than the return of an evil spirit who has been temporarily driven out from the command of one possessed: he would come back armed with increased violence, and the latter state of the conquered would be worse than the former one. There may have been attempts to negotiate with the hereditary enemies of the Slavs, and the stupendous blunders of the Entente, such as the Prinkipo project or the desertion of Odessa, have lent plausible pretexts for such attempts, but the vital interests of Russia require her to join the circle of Western civilisation, and any swerving from the fundamental principle is bound to lead to mischief in the end.

This being so, the leaders of Russia ought to strive for a democratic settlement of Russian constitutional problems. The task of ensuring such a solution is not an easy one. The deplorable state of ignorance and political inexperience of the Russian people is putting serious obstacles in the way of such a solution. Our chief aim is to educate the nation for self-government and political activity. But this cannot be done in a few years, and the constitutional settlement cannot wait. It will have to be taken in hand as soon as the country has been liberated from the incubus of Bolshevism.

In any case, a strong executive organisation will have to be kept up. The dissolution of recent years, manifested in the miscarriage of the war and in the anarchical despotism of the Soviets, has to be arrested; for long years Russian Governments will have to struggle with the consequences of bankruptcy, with disorganised transport, with the demoralisation of working men in town and country. An active and powerful staff of executive officials will be needed to cope with such a situation. Their task will not be a hopeless one, on account of the immense natural resources of the country: it is a world in itself, containing the materials of every kind of wealth, and requiring only intelligent and energetic workers to develop these resources. But the officials of new Russia must not only understand the nature of their special duties and carry them out according to their best ability: they must be careful to avoid the spirit which made their predecessors in old Russia hateful, namely, the spirit of a foreign domination over a subject and inert mass. We need not go back to the age of "enlightened" despotism in the Eighteenth Century in order to discover this spirit at work in the Russian political machine. Its most glorified expression was the rule of Count Witte in Nicholas II's reign. Here was an accomplished bureaucrat, clever and active, full of plans and expedients, lacking insight only in one respect—in his complete estrangement from the life and thought of the nation. It has seemed to some shrewd British observers, for instance to the late

Sir Donald Mackenzie Wallace, that what Russia required was the rule of an efficient Civil Service of the type well known in India. Witte's bureaucracy corresponded exactly to such an ideal: its leaders were certainly well educated, efficient administrators, not fettered by any reactionary prejudices, and yet they remained on the outside of all great problems of social organisation and education. Witte himself was to such an extent blinded by his bureaucratic love of power that he opposed the most hopeful political current of his time—the Zemstvo movement. Some five years before the revolution of 1905 he advised the Emperor to restrict the functions of the Zemstvos because their activity was imperilling autocracy. The recantation of 1905 does not make his misconception less flagrant and less mischievous. Whatever the external forms of the Russian civil service may turn out to be in the future, it will have to remember the object lesson of the downfall of an overbearing bureaucracy divorced from national life.

The problem of organising the democratic mainstays of government is not less ominous. The unpractical idealists of 1905 thought they had discovered a simple formula to solve all difficulties. Let the country be governed by assemblies elected by means of universal, equal, direct, and secret suffrage. This famous formula "with four tails" was proclaimed from every platform and any attempt to introduce some modifications in the sacramental demands was condemned as a device of aristocratic and bureaucratic reactionaries. The sacramental formula was put into practice after the upheaval of 1917, with the result that crowds of uneducated people swamped the elections in the wake of unscrupulous demagogues and wire-pullers. Persons who had sat in the four Dumas of Nicholas II. were *prima facie* handicapped by the fact that they had had some experience of affairs of State. The naïve theory that a modern commonwealth can be ruled by a supposed sum total of all the wills of its individual members is a curious survival of the rationalistic conception of Society prevalent in the Eighteenth Century. We know by this time that votes must not only be counted, but ought to be weighed; the fiction of equality in experience and aptitude, when applied to politically undeveloped communities, is simply an excuse for sleight of hand and log-rolling. The best that can be said for universal suffrage is that it is difficult to substitute for it a reasonable and just scale of citizenship. One qualification, at any rate, can be imposed without any derogation to democratic principles. Let men and women vote without any regard being had to property or class, but let it be recognised that at least elementary education is required from those who are entrusted with a decisive function in the government of their country. If a modest test of literacy were required, somewhat on the lines of the tests used in the United States and contemplated in Canada, possibly one-third of the population of Russia would receive the vote at once, and the expansion of the franchise would depend automatically on the spread of education. This seems a sufficient guarantee both against the blundering of electoral mobs and against the sinister interests of plutocratic and oligarchical groups.

Yet another "tail" of the formula had better be removed. One cannot reasonably expect the huge masses of backward peasantry to be much alive to the importance of problems of national government. Their participation will at best express itself in sporadic efforts. Electoral functions will have to be reduced to the minimum, if they are to retain their political importance. Even populations more accustomed to the requirements of self-government show sometimes a lack of sustained activity: in the election campaign of 1918 in Great Britain, it was a common occurrence that fifty per cent of the electors in certain districts failed to record their votes. The common people in Russia are thoroughly sick of political agitation, and the abstainers will certainly greatly exceed the number of actual voters. Nor is it at all likely that those who do actually vote would clearly understand the issues involved, and steer intelligently between the various shades of party programmes. On the other hand, there is no sufficient reason to suppose that the population does not possess a much livelier interest in and a sufficient knowledge of provincial and local affairs. Perhaps the best expedient would be to drop the requirement of direct election for the National Assembly. A Parliament built up as a Central Conference of representatives of Zemstvos and towns would present much better guarantees of healthy and skilful leadership than an Assembly elected by direct suffrage. Should such an expedient be rejected as undemocratic it would be necessary to insist on the formation of a Senate or Second Chamber representing provincial and municipal units as well as other constituted powers in the State—the Universities, the Clergy, possibly Co-operative Associations and Trade Unions.

But whatever may be the details of constitutional arrangements, it must be borne in mind that a great Social Revolution has taken place, and it would be more or less futile to try to revert to the limitations and privileges of the Old Régime. A government attempting to restore the former status of landed proprietors would be submerged before long in another upheaval of the peasantry. It is not mere greed that has incited the village communes of Great Russia and the small peasant proprietors of the Ukraina to grab the land of the squires. The fundamental reason for the social catastrophe was a congestion of the working population hemmed in by the privileged land-holding of the few. The first condition for a return to social peace is to recognise the expropriation of the squires, to indemnify them as far as possible, and to regularise the new distribution of the soil among the peasants. Napoleon, and even the Bourbons of the Restoration recognised the force of the *fait accompli* in similar circumstances, and the rulers of New Russia are prepared to do the same, if one may judge from their solemn declarations.

We have been concerned with institutions and with the machinery of government, for the single reason that calculations as to this side of the process admit of some probability. But it is evident that there must be a background of moral evolution to all these institutional changes. It is not only knowledge and experience that are required for the building of a Commonwealth, but a certain

spirit of devotion, of self-control, of belief. The most terrible aspect of the Bolshevik mania is the "despair of the State," as General Smuts has put it, the disgust of the millions as regards political ties and duties. This despair is at the back of the bestiality and fiendish cruelty of the struggle. *Homo homini lupus* is, indeed, the right word for this terrible crisis. Is there any reason for supposing that the Russian people are about to overcome this attack of bloodthirsty rage? After all, the prophets of Russia—Tolstoy, Dostoyevsky, Vladimir Solovieff, have revealed to us the psychology of the Russian people not only in the Power of Darkness, the frenzy of the "Possessed," the despair of the "Dead House," but as a mysterious and beneficent force, capable of sincere charity, and most sensitive in its conscience of truth and justice. It is difficult to speak of these things otherwise than in poetical terms, but I should like to point to one sign of the returning consciousness of right and wrong. I mean the revival of religion. In the sad years of the Old Régime, religion had been debased like everything else by the idolatry of absolutism. The Clergy, instead of acting as spiritual teachers, were performers of ceremonies, submissive to the episcopal bureaucrats and to the *Procureur* of the Synod, helpless in their dealings with the intellectuals and with the common people. The upheaval of 1917 brought a crisis in this respect. For a time the Bolsheviks seemed successful in their war against religion; the despairing people were carried away by a mania of sacrilege. But the orgy of godlessness did not last long. The persecution of priests and of the faithful has purified the moral character of the Christian community and recalled it to a sense of the unconquerable power of the spirit. The Patriarch had the strength to anathematise the oppressors and to hold them at bay by his moral prestige. Everywhere confessors died for their faith and thereby vindicated the sincerity of their religion. It would be impossible to express the force of this movement in exact terms, but of one thing there can be no doubt; the degradation of Bolshevism has already secured a truer and loftier conception of the Church than could have been achieved by a more peaceful development. Russian Orthodoxy cannot fall back into the slavery of the Holy Synod after having been regenerated by its martyrs. The revival of a pure Church in Russia means in truth the first step towards the moral and political education of the people. Men live not only by bread, but by the word of God.

Looking back on the wide range of questions raised in this paper, I should like to emphasise that it is neither prediction, nor a concerted plan, nor yet a set of doctrinal affirmations, that I am submitting to the public. The matters discussed are too important, the events expected are too complex, to admit of any treatment on dogmatic lines. And yet those who love Russia cannot help speculating on the best means of raising her again to the rank of a civilised nation. Perhaps some of the thoughts expressed in this article may find sympathy and approval on the part of those who will be responsible for the reconstruction of the country.

PAUL VINOGRADOFF.

THE GERMANS AT VERSAILLES.

JUST before the arrival of Count Brockdorff-Rantzau at the close of a dismally wet day at Versailles, an American member of the Conference whom I had hitherto found optimistic suddenly gave way to a fit of depression. "Can we make peace?" he asked me, and answering his own question, he went on: "No. It is possible that during the month of May we shall agree on some sort of treaty, which under protest Germany will sign without prejudice to her future action, but our interests are too different, the principles on which we proceed are too opposed, to make of this diplomatic instrument a logical and homogeneous document." It was perhaps startling to hear in the very face of the diplomatic enemy an official confession of hopelessness. For my part, while trying hard to take a more cheerful view of the Conference, I cannot but regret that the first task of the statesmen in Paris was not to settle a sort of international code, to accept formally abstract rules based upon the fourteen points of Mr. Wilson, and having, after a longer or shorter discussion, thus laid down the irrevocable plan of the peace, to proceed to apply those rules without regard to their pleasant or unpleasant consequences. To act otherwise was to plunge into incoherence. And as the German delegates stood in the dim light of that little French station it was impossible to resist the melancholy reflection that the Allies were less ready at that moment to receive the Germans than they had been at any period of the past six months. What has passed since does not dispel that impression of a ricketty and ramshackle arrangement.

The Conference has had a fatal habit of procrastination. Instead of coming to grips with realities from the very beginning, it postponed every question which might cause a conflict of opinion. It never had a clear and general conception of the sort of peace it wanted. The constant delay permitted national appetites to grow. The delegates of each country worked for their own ends; and the spirit which animates an Oxford or Cambridge eight was absent from the Council of Four. They worked for a French peace, an Italian peace, an English peace, or an American peace, instead of for a World peace. Outside the Council, the Yugo-Slavs desired a Yugo-Slav peace, the Poles a Polish peace. Japan was watchful of Japanese interests; and all the nations of the Balkans made rival claims which could only be satisfied at the expense of each other. Therefore, in spite of the public clamour for the signing of the treaty, one could only regard the apparition of these visitors to Versailles with apprehension. They came prematurely, in the midst of an Adriatic crisis, of a Shantung crisis, of a Belgian crisis, of a French crisis, with the smoking ruins of the Near East breaking into flames, with India groaning ominously, with Egypt ready for revolt, with the whole Mohametan world stirring to action, and with the shadow of Russia falling formidably over every capital of Europe.

They came either too late or too soon. Nevertheless, the general

impression of those who came into close contact with the German representatives was that they were anxious to make peace as early as possible without regarding the terms too closely. Naturally, they were prepared to take advantage of any opportunity of ameliorating the conditions which presented itself. They would, we told each other, make many feints. They would be clever enough to manœuvre themselves into the position of men fighting for justice, on the side of democracy, sticklers for the principle of national integrity. They would try to show that the Allies, on the contrary, had prepared an unjust peace, that they denied the right to submit that peace to the judgment of the people, that they, in spite of a thousand speeches, effectively denied the right of nations to live under their own laws without having large tracts of territory subtracted by force of conquest. They had even a rival scheme for a Society of Nations. These things were legitimate diplomatic weapons. It was legitimate, too, that they should immediately point out the absence of Italy (a shrewd thrust which more surely than Allied persuasions brought back the Italians post-haste) and the uncertain status of the Yugo-Slavs.

Yet one had the impression that they were anxious to bring the Versailles business to a speedy conclusion. Behind them Germany was rumbling: great fissures were constantly appearing: another, and this time an overwhelming, eruption was imminent. The social chaos which goes by the name of Bolshevism menaced all the old institutions—and they were many—which had escaped overthrow in the Revolution. Only peace, and that a speedy peace, could save the situation. Peace meant for them the lifting of the blockade, the resumption of normal life, with food for the hungry mouths and raw materials for the idle factories. Peace meant for them the docility of the people and the rapid regeneration of the ruined Empire. Even the harshest peace was better than no peace. Better to know their fate and to bear it manfully than to drag on exposed to all the dangers which menace them eternally. In this sense, then, the Germans were more concerned about the differences of the Allies than the Allies themselves seemed to be.

It is necessary to remark that the German delegation was not like the Russian delegation at Brest-Litovsk, a body unused to the ways of diplomacy. It was in no sense an emanation of the people. The Revolution made many changes in Germany. It swept away the old autocracy. But it did not substitute a proletarian dictatorship. It preserved, above all, the old type of diplomatists. When M. Jules Cambon, at the head of a Commission whose duty it was to verify the powers of the German delegates, began his task, he must have encountered many old acquaintances. For the most part, his inquiry was the purest formality. At any rate, with regard to the identity of the guests, their faces were familiar to him. They had moved with him in the same sphere. The "intellectuals" in the administration and in the permanent Government offices had not been dismissed. The most casual observer must have been somewhat astonished at the list of German representatives. They were largely of the "*Ancien Régime*."

What are we to conclude from this armistice between the revolu-

tionary government and the governing classes (to employ the Socialist phraseology)? We can only suppose that Ebert and Scheidemann are fully conscious of the lack of experience in international affairs of their newer colleagues and that they place the interests of the Empire before the interests of their doctrines. On the other hand, the acceptance of the truce by the old diplomacy indicates a flexibility, an adaptation to new conditions. There is on the side of the "ruling classes" a willingness to subordinate their personal dislike of the Revolution to the national welfare. Perhaps even from their personal and political point of view they are wise to keep in their own hands the executive powers. They continue to direct the affairs of Germany. But above all the alliance is against us. There remains a unity in Germany, there remains a Germanic spirit in defeat, which we should not under-estimate. If the movement for closing up the ranks had come from the Right it would probably have failed, and we should have had before us a divided Germany. But the unity of the Left is an accomplished fact. It is a unity which is sternly against the Extremists who would shatter the Empire: and which makes for the consolidation of our principal enemy. This is a phenomenon which we should bear in mind. The deductions to be drawn are obvious.

For them, as for us, the very stones of Versailles contain many sermons. Nothing seemed to me so dramatic as was the announcement that the peace of 1871 would be reversed on the spot where it was signed. History, which is no respecter of persons or of nations, speaks to us all, friend and foe, from that venerable *château* of Versailles. It teaches us that in the old methods of military conquest there is no safety and no permanence. When William I., King of Prussia, was saluted here with the unanimous consent of the German States as the German Emperor, he must have imagined that the victory over France was definitive. He could not have foreseen that where the Hohenzollerns laid the foundation-stone of their House, that House would be demolished in less than fifty years. Bismarck, in wresting Alsace-Lorraine violently from France, could hardly have envisaged the day when his country, humiliated and helpless, would sign away its possessions in the same historic town. The whirligig of time brings its revenges and its reversals. The whole town is full of those memories of the past, a past which was built upon the shifting sands of Might, and not upon the rock of Right. Grandeur and decadence of monarchs and of nations are indelibly associated with the place. The most pessimistic quatrains of Omar Khayyám come into one's mind. One thinks of Jamshyd who glorified and drank deep, when one thinks of the "Roi Soleil." One thinks of this marvellous presentation of the vanity of human things when one hears in imagination the gay sound of violins, the merry laughter of courtiers, drowned in the shrill cries of those women from Les Halles who shrieked for the life of unhappy Marie-Antoinette. But the greatest antithesis is this group of German diplomatists who, in 1919, take upon their shoulders the sins of 1871. We, for our part, should not be deaf to the tongues that whisper their warnings from the trees of Versailles. We must work to establish a real peace and not a mere

truce between the nations which may be broken in favour of one group or another group at any time. Versailles is the most eloquent advocate of a League of Nations which will guarantee a durable peace based upon justice, and not upon an evanescent victory. The choice of this site was (probably unconsciously) the most excellent choice that could have been made.

It is desirable to sum up the results of the Peace Conference not in material terms—the precise territorial settlements, the amount of reparations, the distribution of the German colonies, the possession of the cables, and similar decisions, have in themselves a narrower, and one might almost say local significance, though their implications in some cases are tremendous—but in moral terms. The Conference set out to do two things. It set out to make a new map of the world, and it set out to give a fixed shape to the new spirit of mankind. It has made its map. What has it done with those immense forces which, chaotic and elemental, only needed turning into right channels?

As a spiritual platform from which a splendid appeal would be made to humanity, which would lift us to a higher level, the Conference has not been the success which some of us hoped it would be. It must not be altogether condemned. There is a Profit and Loss account. There is much to be written on both sides of this spiritual Balance-sheet. Has the Conference left the world better than it found it? The answer is that the Conference has accomplished something, but is far from accomplishing all that it might have done. I believe that the great universal heart was really athirst not only for peace but for a new order of things. I believe there was a revolt against war, against the Imperialisms, the national exclusivisms, the gospel of hatred that has so long been taught; and that this yearning for new international relationships, this reaching out for world solidarity, this disgust with militarism and with the ways of the old diplomacy which bartered away peoples as chattels, which worked in the dark and without reference to the masses chiefly concerned, might well have marked a turning point in the painful history of humanity. A nobler impulse towards co-operation, towards emancipation, towards true democracy, might have been given. President Wilson's utterances touched a new note; the future, in spite of the past of blood and tears, appeared really promising. Mr. Lloyd George also, I have reason to believe, strove hard to put in practical form the aspirations of men of goodwill in all the countries of the globe. Unfortunately there were ranged against them all kinds of forces which speedily shattered the dream of the instant application of this new international philosophy to the affairs of the world.

There were not only at home and abroad too many false prophets who pandered to the basest and the most dangerous passions, who directed the emotions of the war-weary peoples into the old paths of greed, of fear, and of hatred; but in the bosom of the Conference itself the same influences worked for the fictitious security of territorial guarantees and of arms, of expansions and of combinations, of all the old wheels-within-wheels of an intricate diplomacy. There are a number of danger-points in Europe; and the battle in the

secret conclaves of the Quai D'Orsay and of the private rooms of the plenipotentiaries raged round these points. The last reason which the statesmen urged was justice, and the desire to remove a possible *casus belli*. It became apparent to the casual reader of newspapers that the elevated language of Mr. Wilson had not been understood by some of his colleagues. The inevitable result was that the public looked on cynically. The public became aware of a certain lack of sincerity. It would, I think, be exceedingly difficult now to arouse the same public enthusiasm for the League of Nations as existed when the project was first introduced in a public sitting of the Conference. The spark of faith has gone. And yet it is precisely that spark of faith which will make possible the League of Nations as a living reality and not as a mere document which will become a dead letter.

Nothing in the whole course of the Conference struck me more forcibly than the indifference with which a few weeks ago the League of Nations in its final form was received. Nobody seemed to care. There were two vital points which, in the opinion of two different countries, had been left out. Did those countries trouble very much? No. France who considered (as the "most menaced country") that a regular inspection of armaments, and the institution of an international Headquarter Staff were essential, made a pious protest at the omission; and was content to leave it at that. This is equivalent to saying that France is not convinced that the League of Nations will be an effective instrument. It means that France will not depend upon the League to defend her from another invasion, will not put her trust in the spirit of concord which the League represents, but, regarding Germany as her dangerous neighbour, her hereditary enemy, will keep her powder dry, will watch the bridge-heads of the Rhine, and will form alliances which will strangely resemble the old Balance of Powers. Already we hear whispers in diplomatic circles of feelers being put out to secure precise military engagements, to have special relationships, to revert to the system of secret understandings and the grouping of nations against nations. This, I need hardly say, is a deplorable disappointment. No such equilibrium which will be perpetual, which will not always be on the point of crashing, can be established. It would be a fatal policy if France really pursued it. My impression is that better counsels will prevail; but for the moment I am trying to point out the cooling off of the first rapturous confidence in a League of Nations. It has been treated as a mere flourish without importance. We have changed our standard of values; there has been a slump in spiritual values.

The action of the Japanese in withdrawing their claims for racial equality is another revelation of the comparative insignificance into which the League has been allowed to fall. To the Japanese the recognition of their equality with other members of the League was of great moment. If America or Australia draw the color line against the yellow peoples, certainly a severe blow is dealt at the spirit of fellowship and of fraternity, certainly the risk of future wars is increased. To me, it is more ominous that Japan does not press her point than if she had insisted on its acceptance before

consenting to become a member of the League. It indicates on the one hand a conviction of its unreality, and on the other hand it indicates the possibility of the League being used as a diplomatic manœuvring ground.

I have no desire, however, to indulge in unrelieved pessimism. I have pointed out the unsatisfactory side of the balance-sheet and there is much more to say. We should not cherish dangerous illusions. Yet on the credit side we have indeed founded the League. It is woefully incomplete, but it is a beginning. I see for it a golden future. It cannot prevent war at present. In the regulation of armaments it is sadly inefficient. Yet it provides a valuable piece of machinery. It is a factor which cannot be left out of our calculations when we are considering the prospects of peace and of war. It is there to offer its arbitration. It is there to pass a moral judgment. No nation having subscribed to the principles of the League can afford to affront the conscience of mankind. We must not deceive ourselves: we have seen already Italy in a war-like mood, and if the same circumstances arose to-morrow elsewhere we can only presume that the existence of the League would be ignored if national passions reached a certain height. It is rather as an educative organ that I regard the League. It will be perpetually before the peoples. It will hold up an ideal. Gradually mankind will learn to trust it. There will be a growing confidence among the nations. If war can only be staved off for ten years I believe the League will be in full working order, that it will have given unmistakable proofs of its value; and that a better feeling will have been created. The Conference, one cannot help saying, has not only neglected to employ the spiritual forces in the world but has actually created general irritation and suspicion. The League, which has been erected by the Conference, will, however, allay that irritation and suspicion, and before long the machine will have a soul. It will be driven by the motive-power of an unselfish and humane desire for peace. Two things it must do, and that quickly: it must bring Germany into the fold and it must strive for a general disarmament.

The Labour Convention, which I am glad to say is chiefly a British achievement, is again a piece of machinery which in itself is disappointing; but which may easily have profound consequences. Here once more I count upon its moral authority. Mr. Barnes is not claiming too much when he says that this Charter will bind together the workers of the world in closer ties, and will bind together the workers and their employers, and will further link up workers and employers with their Governments, and those Governments with each other, by virtue of their common action. The programme which will be immediately submitted is undoubtedly a modest one. But the point is that the Convention must have a great spiritual effect, teaching us mutual respect and giving us mutual interests in the people of those nations who are less happy than ourselves. This must re-act upon our general international relationship.

There are a number of positive ideas which have been launched. If they have not always been realised, nevertheless the ideas will

persist and will tend to realise themselves. We have as a result of the Peace Conference a new sense of the rights of nationalities. We accept without question, in theory at least, the principle of self-disposition for all the nations of the earth. We have written in our international code the right of nations to economic existence. We have pronounced against the old alien oppressions. We have spoken in favour of democratic institutions, and if we have not always acted in conformity with our utterances those utterances are no less vital. Secret diplomacy is condemned to death. It is not dead and will probably not die just yet. But die it will. We have a new knowledge of each other; we have learnt to try to understand our neighbours' point of view, and this in the long run will lead to deeper esteem. The old insularity is broken down. We have a sense, a growing sense, of interdependence. One may be properly critical of the Peace Conference, but one cannot deny that great ideas have been sown abroad, and one cannot doubt that those ideas will bear their fruit.

Thus there is no need to abandon optimism. The Conference had much to contend with. It had to contend with memories of old wrongs, with visions of new dangers. You cannot stamp out the ancient feuds in a moment. Europe is scarred from the Baltic to the Black Sea with battlegrounds of short and of long date. We have lived in watertight compartments, always regarding the foreigner as a potential enemy. In the re-arrangement of the world it was natural that each nation should claim all that it could possibly claim for itself. The spirit of huckstering which was engendered was not the spirit in which it was easy to construct a Universal League of Peace. Statesmen were short-sighted. I believe that if they had appealed to the nobler instincts in their people, the people would have responded. But now the period of passions is passing. We shall soon begin to settle down to work again and we shall realise the need of co-operation if we are to build up the world on the wreckage. It is then that the ideas which have been planted will begin to flourish. Even the failures, in the spiritual domain, of the Peace Conference will help us. We shall see where we went astray. It is sincerely to be hoped that we shall have bold leaders, men with vision to guide the great currents which will sweep mankind. The reason, as I have said before, why Bolshevism has succeeded in spite of its crudity is that it offered to the aspiring peoples a tangible hope of escape from the old conditions. It led those peoples into a quagmire. It is for the true statesmen to realise the desires of mankind and to lead them to the Promised Land.

History has once more been written at Versailles. Let us hope that Versailles has for the last time recorded a war which was bred by the spirit of injustice, by national hatreds, by national greed and covetousness; and that the new international philosophy has been veritably born.

SISLEY HUDDLESTON.

WHITHER DRIFTS INDIA ?

I.

WHITHER drifts India? Towards bitterness, chaos, and strife, or towards peace, contentment, and progress within the Empire? The recent troubles in India force these questions upon the attention of every one interested in the orderly march forward of the human race. At all events, persons concerned in Indian welfare, and in the evolution of the British Empire towards a confraternity of free nations, cannot afford to shelve these issues.

Why did riots break out in India in March and April? Several explanations, official and otherwise, have been offered. The British people have been told that the passage of the Rowlatt Act against the entreaties and warnings of Indians has been seized upon by the agitators as an excuse for inaugurating an anti-British movement in India, and that since that Act was designed solely to deal with anarchical and revolutionary conspiracies, it can have no terror for law-abiding citizens. They have further been informed that Indian malcontents were successful in fomenting trouble because there existed in India much unrest, owing to the abnormal rise in prices, the acute shortage of food, the ravages caused by influenza, the hardships incidental upon recruiting and war in general, and the approaching dissolution of the Turkish Empire. The widest possible publicity has also been given, through the British press, to speciously worded theories ascribing the gravity of the Indian situation to the nefarious work secretly carried on by German, Turkish, and Bolshevik agents. One or two correspondents have strayed from these orthodox explanations to the extent of hinting that the delay in giving effect to the British promise to reform the Indian constitution, and the persistent and noisy propaganda that persons opposed to such reforms have carried on, in Britain and India, have undermined Indian faith in British goodwill.

Some of these explanations cannot be lightly dismissed; but, all put together, they do not reveal the root-cause of the trouble, and, therefore, lead us nowhere. They set thinking persons wondering if Indians are really so bereft of common sense and political acumen that, after having remained staunch during the darkest hours of the war, when the fate of the Empire hung in the balance, they should begin to play into the hands of the enemy when Britain stands triumphant, Germany and Turkey have been brought to their knees, and Russia is reduced to chaos, and, moreover, when British statesmen are devising measures to advance India towards responsible self-government. On the very face of it, that suggestion is so preposterous that anyone who knows aught of educated Indians will dismiss it as unthinkable.

It is no less absurd to feel secure because rioting has ceased, and quiet has been restored by firing volleys into unarmed crowds, dropping bombs from aeroplanes, scouring the country with mobile columns and armoured cars, and condemning a large number of Indians to death, transportation, or varying terms of

imprisonment by courts-martial and other forms of summary trial. If, for the sake of argument, it be granted that the military and punitive measures employed by "the strong men on the spot" have proved an unqualified success, whither does such rule lead Britain in India? British bayonets and bombs may, indeed, be very effective; but is there any Briton worthy the name who wishes to substitute them for rule by Indian consent? To that question there can be but one answer.

Let us, therefore, try to discover what is amiss in India, why there is unrest there, why Indians inaugurated a movement of passive resistance, and why they deliberately set out to defy laws passed by constituted authority. And when we have discovered the root-cause of the trouble, let us seek the remedy for it.

II.

For the purpose of such an investigation, it is not necessary to rake up the dust of the remote past. Fortunately for India and the British Empire, at the outbreak of hostilities Indian leaders possessed the Imperial patriotism and the political insight to close the chapter of discord in Indo-British annals and to begin a new chapter of harmony.

It will be recalled that when the European sky became overcast with war-clouds, the Indian situation was critical. Educated Indians felt aggrieved at the status they occupied in the administration of their domestic affairs. Certain measures applied to Indian settlers in South Africa by the Union Government had heated the Indian temper, and but for the statesmanship shown by Baron Hardinge of Penshurst, then Viceroy and Governor-General of India, there is no telling what might have happened. The treatment accorded to Indians settled in Canada also aroused resentment in India, and about the time the war broke out a shipload of Indians was starting for a Canadian port in defiance of regulations that the Federal Government at Ottawa had made, which, in effect, prohibited Indian emigrants from entering that Dominion.

When Indians, however, found that the British Empire was being assailed by an unscrupulous enemy who had taken great pains to prepare, in secret, to strike a swift and sure blow, they did not lose a moment in sinking their differences with the Government and in offering to do everything in their power to assist the British to prosecute the war. They possessed, moreover, the good sense to abstain from making capital out of Britain's necessity. Even Mr. Bal Gangadhar Tilak, the Indian Nationalist leader, who had just been released from prison after serving his full sentence of six years for sedition, exhorted his countrymen to strengthen the British hand.

Even though the small expeditionary force that Great Britain had managed to hurry across the Channel to support the hard-pressed French and Belgians, had suffered heavily and was facing terrible odds, and India was the only part of the British Empire where men of the first line were available in considerable number, yet there were persons in that country, boasting of the British blood in their veins, who tried to raise racial and religious issues to

prevent Indians from fighting on European soil. Lord Hardinge was, however, too wise to pay attention to such an agitation.

The initiative for employing Indian men and money in the war came from Indians—and not from the Government, which was neither of the people nor by the people. Indians of all races and religions, and in all stations of life, volunteered to fight. Indian members of the Imperial Legislative Council asked that India might be permitted to share with Britain the financial burden of the war. Had Lord Hardinge been “a strong man,” instead of being imaginative and tactful, he might not have permitted Indians to take this initiative. There was nothing in the Indian constitution to compel him to ask leave from Indians before sending troops to fight beyond the Indian frontier or making India pay towards their cost. Troops—and not merely British troops in the pay of India—had more than once before been sent upon non-Indian expeditions, and in more than one instance the cost incurred upon such expeditions had been saddled upon the Indian Exchequer. Had Lord Hardinge chosen to follow in this beaten track, there was nothing to prevent him. In that case, however, he might have had the disadvantage of swimming against the current.

If Indians had not taken the initiative, the contribution made by the Government of India, which was not put into power by Indians and was not even Indian in *personnel*, to be used to crush a Power that threatened the supremacy of the nation that ruled India would have appeared in the light of an exaction. Putting aside all considerations of expediency, the moral effect of such an action would have been most serious. In giving India the initiative Lord Hardinge obtained much more than that negative advantage. With Indian leaders at his back, he could send many more soldiers than he would have been able to do if India's heart was not in the fight. So many soldiers did he send out of the country that, at one time, there were but 15,000 British officers and men in India, and, as a member of his Government put it to me, he “ruled India with the police.” To Indian leaders that was an open secret, and yet calm was preserved in India.

In thus allowing Indians to initiate the movement for assisting Britain in her death-struggle on the European Continent, Lord Hardinge gave a new direction to the governance of India. He may not have intended to make a new departure, perhaps he was not quite aware that he was setting up a new constitutional standard in India; but nevertheless he inaugurated a new constitutional era in that country—an era in which the people's representatives acquired a status that they had never before possessed in the governance of their land. The provision for moving resolutions made by Lord Morley in his Act of 1909, which Indians had spoken of as dead wood, became, all of a sudden, the one living part of the Indian constitution—it blossomed like the Glastonbury thorn. Constitutional history records many another event that, at the time, did not appear very important, but which gave a new direction to the administration of the country in which it occurred.

The meeting of the Imperial Legislative Council that took place on September 9th, 1914, was epoch-making in the history of the Indian

constitution. For the first time since the control of India passed out of Indian hands, an Indian (Sir G. Chitnavis) moved a resolution asking the Government to let Indians "share in the heavy burden imposed by the war upon the United Kingdom." Every Indian present supported that resolution. These proceedings metamorphosed India's position in the British Empire from that of a dependant into that of a partner. It initiated in India government by the consent of the people, theretofore undreamt of.

III.

This seed of democracy, planted in the soil of India in the early days of the war, should have been protected against unfavourable winds, and its growth judiciously stimulated. Had that been done, I am sure that the disturbances of which the world has heard so much during recent weeks would not have broken out, and the constitutional development of India within the British Empire would have gone on harmoniously.

Unfortunately, however, persons whose vested interests were threatened by Indian political progress leagued together to prevent Indians from deriving any benefit from participation in a war waged to uphold the principles of national rights and self-determination. Even during the most critical period of the struggle, they never forgot their vendetta against educated Indians, and carried on a vigorous campaign to belittle and to abuse them. It was said that the Indians who fought and the Indians who agitated had nothing in common. It was even hinted that if the agitators kept quiet, it was merely because they knew that no movement that they might set on foot had the least chance of success. The British were solemnly told that if they transferred even a shred of authority to educated Indians they would betray the implicit trust that the Indian masses had reposed in their present rulers.

The Defence of India Act—the Indian form of D.O.R.A.—to which Indians in the Imperial Legislative Council had given their consent, even though they felt that in view of the repressive measures that the Government already possessed, such an Act was unnecessary, merely because they wished to humour Lord Hardinge, who emphasised its *permissive* character, was widely used to deprive Indians of their freedom without affording them any opportunity for trial. Official and semi-official explanations were made to justify wholesale internments; but even when uttered by a sympathetic Governor, they failed to convince Indians, who had no faith whatever in the police, and who consequently distrusted executive action based upon secret police reports untested in an open, regular court of law.

While the number of Indian internees was steadily mounting, month after month passed by without the authorities in Britain or in India giving the slightest indication of their intention to remove the disabilities that unjustly branded Indians as members of an inferior race. As months lengthened into years, and Indians not only failed to detect any signs that a liberal policy was about to be applied to India, but, on the contrary, actually saw and heard much which made them doubt that the formulas of freedom expounded

by the Empire's statesmen would be applied to India, they began to demand a definite declaration of the policy Britain intended to pursue in India.

The wisest course that British statesmen could have pursued would have been to have lost not a moment in declaring, unequivocally, that India would share, freely and fully, in the freedom for which her sons were so valiantly and unselfishly fighting; but the men in power at Whitehall let time slip through their fingers without taking any action to set the Indian mind at rest. Not until the disclosures made by the Mesopotamia Commission led to a change at the India Office was any tangible expression given of British intentions towards India.

Though somewhat halting in spirit and language, the pronouncement made on August 20th, 1917, declaring that the "policy of His Majesty's Government, with which the Government of India are in complete accord, is that of increasing the association of Indians in every branch of the administration and the gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to the progressive realisation of responsible government in India, as an integral part of the British Empire," did much to revive faith in British integrity. When the Montagu Mission reached India, towards the end of that year, Indians felt that they were on the eve of a new constitutional era.

As the situation was mending, however, the privileged classes, nervous about their vested interests, set up an agitation that raised grave doubts in the Indian mind about Britain's sincerity in regard to putting into effect the solemn pledge made by His Majesty's Government. In speeches, articles, and notes contributed to the British press, and in circulars and leaflets issued by persons belonging to those classes, attempts were made to poison the British mind against the eminent statesman who had undertaken Indian reform, and against educated Indians. From the statements that were iterated and reiterated, from all sorts of platforms, Indians could not but derive the impression that, racially and otherwise, the Secretary of State for India could not speak for Britain, that the declaration he had made did not commit anybody but himself, and that India had been conquered by the sword and would continue to be ruled by the sword, no matter if Indians cried themselves hoarse for Dominionhood. The uneasiness caused in the Indian mind by such talk was greatly heightened by the delay in the publication of the report containing the conclusions reached by the Montagu Mission. The form in which the report was finally published, in July last, lent itself to misrepresentation. Persons interested in Indian banking, commerce, industries, and public services lost no time in declaring that it contained the views of the Secretary of State and the Viceroy, to which His Majesty's Government would not lend any support, and that when the right time came the British nation would refuse to hand India over to an unrepresentative, irresponsible, sordidly selfish and grossly incapable set of Indians who would bleed the Indian masses and rapidly reduce the country to bankruptcy and chaos. The uneasiness kept on growing as the Cabinet, which contained men whose record inspired fear in the

Indian mind, made no effort to put an end to such talk, as months were allowed to elapse without any announcement being made about the appointment of the three committees foreshadowed in the Montagu-Chelmsford report, as persons with vested interests in India kept on delivering impassioned harangues to bring about the "whittling down" of the Montagu-Chelmsford scheme which, even as it stood, was considered inadequate by nearly every Indian capable of thinking politically, as the "Indian" Civil Service raised the standard of revolt reminiscent of the agitation it had launched a generation ago, which ended in the humiliation of that true friend of India—the first Lord Ripon, and the highest officials in the land seemed to side with the Civil Servants.

IV.

While Indians were full of resentment at the disabilities under which they laboured in spite of the war, and tortured with anxiety regarding the future of India within the Empire, the Government of India appointed a Committee (1) to investigate and report on the nature and extent of the criminal conspiracies connected with the revolutionary movement in India; and (2) to examine and consider the difficulties that had arisen in dealing with such conspiracies and to advise as to the legislation, if any, necessary to enable Government to deal effectively with them.

Though a High Court Judge was imported from London, and Britons and Indians with judicial and legal qualifications and experience were associated with him, yet Indians suspected that the appointment of the Committee was merely a move made by the permanent officials to justify the large number of internments made in Bengal and elsewhere, and to find an excuse for perpetuating, in one form or another, the Defence of India Act, to enable the officials to continue to exercise, in time of peace, the arbitrary powers that they enjoyed during the war. The procedure of the (Rowlatt) Committee confirmed these suspicions. It did not take the trouble to travel about India, but, with the exception of four sittings at Lahore (the Punjab), conducted all its enquiries at Calcutta. It examined comparatively few witnesses, whose names and qualifications to speak it refused to disclose, and many of whom, Indians fear, were selected upon the recommendation of the police because they would strengthen the case made out by them. It relied altogether, or almost altogether, upon statements prepared by the secret service and other executive officials. No report based upon investigation conducted in such a manner could impress Indians as trustworthy.

On April 15th, 1918, Mr. Justice Rowlatt submitted the Committee's report to the Government of India, which, after a short time, published it with certain elisions. It recommended the enactment of special measures to deal with the situation when the Defence of India Act ceased to operate—(1) punitive measures: that is to say, "measures better to secure the conviction and punishment of offenders," and (2) preventive measures: "measures to check the spread of conspiracy and the commission of crime." In asking

for drastic changes in the processes of law, and the perpetuation, after the war, of some of the worst provisions of the Defence of India Act, the Committee did not hesitate to drag in "disbanded soldiers," of whom "there will be large numbers, especially in the Punjab," and "among whom it may be possible to stir up discontent." What solicitude!

The findings of the Rowlatt Committee were bitterly resented by Indians, and their recommendations were assailed from one end of the country to the other. The political enemies of Indians, however, saw in the report a most useful weapon to block Indian progress. They abused the Secretary of State for India for withholding its publication in Britain, and when it was finally issued as a White Paper, gave it the widest possible publicity, with a view to prejudicing Britons against Indian reform.

Inasmuch as the Government of India, as well as His Majesty's Government, were committed to Indian reform, and Indians of every shade of political opinion resented the implications made by the Rowlatt Committee and questioned the soundness of its recommendations, it would have been expedient to bow to Indian opinion and shelve the report—at any rate, until the constitutional reforms had been inaugurated and the new legislative machinery designed to give larger and better representation to Indians could deal with the proposals. The bureaucracy had, however, made up its mind to add to the ample repressive measures that it possessed before the war began, and, brushing aside Indian appeals and protests, it embodied the Rowlatt recommendations into two separate Bills and introduced them into the Imperial Legislative Council.

One of these Bills (No. 1 of 1919), designed to alter the Indian Penal Code, was so mutilated in Committee that the Government was only too glad to move for its publication in the various *Gazettes* to elicit opinion in regard to it. The other measure (Bill No. 2 of 1919), designed to deal with men of the type who had been interned by the hundred, met a different fate. The Home Member (corresponding to the Home Secretary), in charge of it, adopted an attitude in the Committee that made the most optimistic of Indians feel utterly hopeless. The only two changes of any importance that the Government finally consented to make were to restrict its scope to revolutionary and anarchical crime, and to limit its life to three years. These concessions, together with the pledges given by the Government, however, failed to make Indians take a favourable view of the measure, which they considered would menace Indian freedom, especially as it would be employed by an Executive whose record in such matters was as black as it could be.

How different was the session of the Imperial Legislative Council at which this "Black Bill," as it is universally called in India, was rushed through from the one held almost exactly four years before, at which the resolution asking that India be permitted to share in the financial burden of the war was passed! Whereas in 1914 every Indian voted with the officials, in 1918 every chosen representative of the people recorded his vote against the measure that the officials were forcing through the Council, or abstained from voting. Whereas, in 1914, Lord Hardinge had set up a new standard of the

governance of India by the consent of her people, and thereby inspired fresh hope in the Indian heart, in 1919 his immediate successor made it plain to Indians that he possessed the full power to make the official will prevail, and, whether Indians liked it or not, they would be ruled as the officials willed, no matter how much the official will might be at variance with the wishes of the people's representatives.

I say people's representatives, because the Pundit Madan Mohan Malaviya and others who were suppressed by the merciless official *bloc* in 1919 were the same men whose speeches, delivered on September 9th, 1914, committing India to the support of the military operations, were cabled out by the Viceroy and read by grateful Ministers in Parliament, and later incorporated in a White Paper. Surely the representative character of these persons did not change with the signing of the Armistice!

It is not necessary for me to summarise subsequent events—how Mr. M. K. Gandhi and others initiated the movement “passively” to resist this “lawless law,” as an eminent jurist has put it, and other measures taken by Indians to protest against the Rowlatt Act. Nor is it necessary for me to chronicle the details of the collision between Indians and officials, and the shootings and hangings and imprisonments. These events occurred only the other day, and the Press gave more or less full reports of them. Anyone who has taken the trouble to read the narrative of events that I have presented with as much fairness as I could, does not need to be told where the seat of the trouble lies. One has but to consider the incidents at the two sessions of the Imperial Legislative Council that I have related to realise what is amiss in India.

In my judgment, the root-cause of the trouble is that in the governance of India the British persist in being un-British. They try to have one code of political morality for themselves and another for India. Waves of reaction and coercion succeed waves of generous impulses. No wonder that Indians feel perplexed, discouraged, fretful. No wonder that there is unrest. Let Britain have a positive policy for India—a policy just and progressive, in consonance with her traditions—and let her follow out that policy consistently: I am certain she will win the affection and gratitude of Indians, and the unrest will be turned into a force making for harmony and progress. Repression must cease. Reform must begin.

ST. Nihal Singh.

NOTE.—Since the above was written the Secretary of State has made an important statement in Parliament, in which he acknowledged that Indians were universally opposed to the Rowlatt Act, but declared that it must stand, as it was needed to deal with the existing anarchical and revolutionary situation; and in which he made a strong plea for a speedy and generous measure of reform. If I had the opportunity to do so, I would not alter a word that I wrote before; but I would add that in following a policy of concession-cum-repression, Mr. Montagu is making a grave mistake. That policy has proved an utter failure, and it is particularly unwise to persist with it when the war has altered everything.

S. N. S.

THE FUTURE OF TURKEY.

FROM the moment of the entry of Turkey into the war, the Near and Middle Eastern Question became one of the most important problems, if not actually the most important problem, to come up for settlement at the termination of hostilities. Before entering into a discussion of that question itself let me, however, very briefly refer to the extent of the areas affected, to certain documents, which may or may not have their direct or indirect bearing upon the decisions to be arrived at in Paris, and to the nature of the task involved. In the first connection it is only necessary to remind my readers that, in considering the future of the Ottoman Empire, we must include not only the pre-war Asiatic Dominions of the Sultan, but also what remained of Turkey-in-Europe after the Balkan Wars, those Ægean Islands, the futures of which were not definitely decided at the outbreak of the war, and lastly, the districts of Erivan, Kars, and Batum, annexed by Russia as a result of her Turkish War of 1877-1878. These being the areas under discussion we find that among other arrangements to be taken into account are the treaty of Lausanne,* the decision of the London Ambassadorial Conference upon the Ægean Islands question,† the then secret treaty made with Italy in April, 1915,‡ the agreement arrived at between Great Britain, France, and Russia in the Spring of 1916,§ and lastly the terms of the Armistice and the clause of the League of Nations Covenant which abrogates all obligations between members inconsistent with its terms.

Whilst it was the German and Austro-Hungarian autocracies who made the war, hostilities could not have been prolonged as they were prolonged unless these autocracies had been supported by the respective peoples. The case of Turkey is, however, different for several distinct reasons. The Committee of Union and Progress (particularly some of its leaders), which constituted the Government, controlled and dominated the country by violence and by the direct assistance of German officers and German forces, contrary to the will of a large section of the Moslem and Christian inhabitants, who were not only opposed to the war, but who had always hated the Government which made it. In other words, the party in power achieved its objects by direct force and because of the shortcomings in Allied Diplomacy, because of the natural fear and dislike of Russia, which exists throughout Turkey, and because the people

* By this treaty, signed on October 12th, 1912, Italy was to retain, nominally temporarily, twelve of the Ægean Islands, including Rhodes, situated off the coast of Asia Minor.

† This decision, arrived at during the winter of 1913-1914, gave to Greece all the Ægean Islands occupied by her during the Balkan Wars, except Imbros, Tenedos and Castellorizzo.

‡ By this agreement, between England, France and Russia on the one side, and Italy on the other, the last mentioned country was to obtain the twelve Dodekanese Islands in full possession, and in addition her interests in South Western Asia Minor were recognised.

§ This agreement, which so far as Russia is concerned is naturally now inoperative, defined the zones of influence and territorial acquisition in Asiatic Turkey, and in particular guaranteed to France very considerable areas, the future of which is disputable.

were led to believe that war on the side of the Central Powers would mean the reconquest of territories, particularly certain of the *Ægean* Islands lost during the campaign of 1912-13. On the other hand, whilst the Armenian massacres of 1915 were conducted in a manner so different from the system employed in former years, as to prove that they must have been actually encouraged by Germany, these massacres could not have been carried out but for the brutality of the Turkish leaders and people. It is this brutality, best described by Ambassador Morgenthau in his book, "*Secrets of the Bosphorus*," which constitutes the real Ottoman crime in the war, and it is largely as a consequence of it that its instigators will have to pay the penalty.

These being the circumstances, there are two conditions—conditions in a way inter-dependent—which must be realised in any peace made with Turkey. Firstly, the Ottoman Government, having acted as a tool and instrument of Prussianism, safeguards must be established against the recurrence of a like policy, and against pan-Turkish or pan-Islamistic intrigues, destined to effect the maintenance of stable conditions in Allied territories inhabited by Mohammedans. And, secondly, there is the direct Allied obligation of terminating once for all the misgovernment and oppression which, in the past, have rendered the lives of the subject races domiciled in the Ottoman Empire well-nigh intolerable. In other words, as Great Britain has been the means of the Moslem and other minority populations of India living at peace with the Hindus, so must the victors in the war create a situation which will enable the Turks and non-Turks and the Moslems and the Christians to dwell together on neighbourly terms. The realisation of this condition is necessary not only in the interests of humanity and to fulfil the principles for which we have been fighting, but also because so long as there is unrest and disorder in Turkey, so long will there be an ever recurring excuse for foreign intervention—intervention undertaken nominally in the interests of the peoples concerned, but really for selfish and aggressive purposes. These being the requirements, it therefore remains to decide the method to be employed in the application of certain general principles to what was Turkey, and to come to a conclusion as to the manner in which, where they cannot govern themselves alone, the peoples concerned shall be assisted to further the development of their own nationalities and lands.

Sir Edwin Pears, in his book, "*Forty Years in Constantinople*," correctly says that the first question to arise is "whether Turkey can again become an Empire entitled to rank among the Great Powers." Before, however, endeavouring to deal with this question in its broader aspects, I propose briefly to discuss the future of Constantinople, that is, of that city, the Bosphorus, the Sea of Marmora, and the Dardanelles—a future which, as the above-mentioned author shows, constitutes a highly important factor in the Turkish problem. This importance is due to three more or less distinct conditions. Firstly, various States bordering on the Black Sea, some of which will assume a greater significance, and others of which will actually come into being as a result of the war, are dependent upon the Dardanelles for access to the sea.

Secondly, there is no part of the world in which there are more international interests involved than those bound up with the Straits and the areas to which they lead. And thirdly, by arriving at a solution of the Constantinople question, an effective barrier against German aggression will have been established, and the settlement of the Middle Eastern Question will thereby have been permanently and immeasurably facilitated.

To define more closely the meaning of Constantinople, I think that that area should be bounded in Europe and on the north-west by the Enos-Midia line, a line which was accepted by the Great Powers as the European frontier of Turkey at the time of the signature of the Treaty of London in 1913, and a line which was agreed to by Great Britain and France as the boundary of the zone promised to Russia in March, 1915. In Asia Minor, the district lying to the north of the Gulf of Ismid, together with a strip of territory on the south of the Marmora and of the Dardanelles should be incorporated. The establishment of such a zone, which should include the Islands of Imbros, Tenedos, and Castellorizzo, would render the European shores of the Straits defensible against whatever Balkan State—I think it should be Bulgaria—is allowed to extend her territory up to the Enos-Midia line. Moreover, in Asia, even if Broussa were left to the Turks, the eastern and southern shores of the Bosphorus, the Marmora, and the Dardanelles, would be practically assured against aggression on the part of that people.

Were something corresponding to these frontiers to be accepted, the predominating question would then be one as to the status of the *régime* to be established. Undoubtedly this world highway should be internationalised, unfortified, and open at all times, to the ships of commerce and of war of all nations. Moreover, as is the case with the Suez Canal, the Straits should be neutralised, that is to say, no belligerent act should be permitted to take place there, except in the case of an attack from without. The Administration, Government, and policing on land and sea should either be carried on by one country—if possible, the United States—under a Mandate from the League of Nations, or by an International Commission, more or less of the same kind as that responsible for the Lower Danube or for the Suez Canal, enemy countries not being allowed to be represented until such time as it may be decided to permit them to enter the League of Nations.

So far as Turkey is concerned the arrival at such an arrangement, the administrative expenses of which could be defrayed by maritime dues and by the ordinary taxation of the inhabitants, would carry with it one of three results. Firstly, that country might remain the nominal sovereign Power, her flag continuing to fly at Constantinople. This would be in keeping with the declaration of Mr. Lloyd George, made in January, 1918, to the effect that we do not challenge the maintenance of the Ottoman Empire, with its capital at Constantinople, and it would not interfere with the continued existence of Turkey as a Great Power. Secondly, the Sultan and his Government might be compelled to seek refuge in Asia Minor. Although this would be contrary to the letter, if not

to the spirit of the above-mentioned declaration, it would still be in keeping with Mr. Wilson's twelfth "Point," in which the question of Turkish sovereignty on the Straits was left open. And, thirdly, Turkey might be given the choice of either maintaining her Capital in a city over which she would have no actual control, or of moving it to some other Asiatic city, where she would have more real power. The presentation of such an alternative would have for advantages that whilst the Allies would not have actually "deprived" Turkey of her capital, they would, in fact, have secured either the real control or the actual possession of an area, which must now fall under direct or indirect international jurisdiction.

The future of Asiatic Turkey is complicated by the fact that whilst the Turks only constitute an Army of Occupation, they are actually the largest element of the population in many of the districts which they misrule and by the numerous international interests which cannot be ignored. In arriving at a decision upon this question the European Allies and the United States will, therefore, be compelled to take a broad view of the whole situation, and to recognise that there are two alternatives for the solution of the question under discussion. The adoption of the first would entail the disappearance of Turkey as a Great Power, and the termination of her existence in Europe. Though certain parts of the former dominions of the Sultan, with their capital at Konia or Broussa, might remain Turkish, there would come into being a number of new States, more or less corresponding to those mentioned below. In this case these States, or autonomous regions, would be freed of Ottoman rule not only in fact but in name, and the areas in question would probably pass under the supervision of the League of Nations. That supervision might be executed under a unified Mandate for the whole area, or it might be carried out by means of separate Mandates for the different and more or less distinct districts. In the former case no doubt whatever rests in my mind that the Allies should try to persuade the United States, who occupy a unique and disinterested position in regard to the Eastern question, to undertake the task, and in the latter I think that endeavours should be made to induce America to take over the control of the Straits and of the future Armenia. The situations in other localities would have to be superintended by the various countries the most closely interested.

If the mandate or mandates were to be for an indefinite period, a solution of the question, somewhat on the above lines, would have the dual advantage of being practically final and of gratifying the sentiments of the various now subject nationalities. But, on the other hand, it would appear to carry with it a practical reversal of Mr. Lloyd George's expressed war aims, and it would hardly be in keeping with the spirit of Mr. Wilson's declarations. Moreover, the creation of new States, actually entirely independent of Turkey, would entail difficulties far greater than those to be incurred in the recognition of "separate national conditions" in various areas and in the establishment "of security of life and an absolutely unmolested opportunity of autonomous development" to which the

British Premier and the President of the United States are respectively pledged. And lastly, the actual splitting up of the Ottoman Empire might raise resentment among all "True Believers," for it would seem to divest the Sultan of his principal remaining claim to the Caliphate—a claim depending upon the fact that he was or is the greatest Mohammedan ruler of the day. By raising such a question the Allies would force into prominence a problem which depends for solution, not upon the victors of the war, but upon the Moslem world. For these and other reasons, therefore, it seems to me preferable to seek a solution of the Turkish question in the second alternative. Its adoption would not entail the actual disruption of the Ottoman Empire, and the Turkish flag might well continue to fly in all or almost all the areas directly governed from Constantinople at the time of the outbreak of the war. Coupled with these conditions, which I think would be less resented by the Turks and their supporters than would be the total disintegration of the Empire, the different nationalities or areas should be given the fullest measures of autonomy under the guarantee and supervision of the League of Nations or its mandatories.

It is not possible, within the confines of an article such as this, to lay down definitely the number or the nature of the new States or autonomous regions which would come into existence under such a scheme. Still less is it feasible to outline in detail what should be their frontiers or exact systems of government. These questions must be influenced by many factors concerning which we have no official information and in particular by the amount of territory to be included respectively in the new Armenia and in the area over which the Turks will be left the direct or indirect control. So far as Armenia is concerned, the first necessity is to endeavour to reconcile the claims put forward on her behalf with those based by France upon the agreement with England and Russia made in the spring of 1916. Whilst public opinion seems to be divided upon the present validity of that agreement, it is obvious that France should be the Mandatory Power for Syria. If this be so the only question left open for discussion is as to whether that country should include within her zone the vilayet of Adana together with a considerable area lying to the East and North-east of it. Here I think that the identity of the Mandatory Power in Armenia becomes of immense importance, for if America is to be persuaded to undertake this responsibility, Armenia must include, not merely just such an area as Europe might consider a disencumbrance, but, in fact, practically so much or so little as the Government of Washington might believe to be necessary to make its work a success. Thus whilst the little Republic of Ararat, composed of the districts of Erivan, Kars and Batum, is reported to have elected to become and therefore should become part of the new Armenia, it seems to me that, in the above mentioned circumstances, it would be for America to decide how much of the six vilayets should be incorporated, and whether it would be necessary to extend the frontier of the new province so as to include a port or ports upon the Mediterranean, or whether Alexandretta, proclaimed a free port under the Anglo-Franco-Russian

agreement of 1916, would, with that status, provide a satisfactory southern approach to the sea.

As no serious division of opinion seems to exist to the effect that Mesopotamia, Arabia and Palestine, the last mentioned as a practically Jewish State, are to have a British mandate or mandates we can pass at once to a discussion of the futures of the areas which remain. Personally I am convinced that all Central Asia Minor, extending from the Black Sea Coast to the Mediterranean, and including at least the vilayets of Kastamouni, Angora, the greater parts of Konia and of Broussa, together with Western Adana, should remain directly or indirectly Ottoman. Such an arrangement would give to Turkey areas which really constitute "the homelands of the Turkish race" and assure to her adequate access to the sea through her own territory, and also by way of Scutari and Smyrna—ports where, whatever be their future status, special commercial *régimes* will no doubt be instituted.

We now come to the highly vexed questions of Smyrna and Adalia. So far as the first of these areas is concerned, if it is to be taken away from Turkey, there is no doubt that the city, together with its hinterland and a coastal region to the North and South of it, should pass under the influence of Greece or be ruled with a Mandate by that country. To fulfil the principle of nationalities too, Greece should certainly secure possession of the Ægean Islands held by Italy under the Treaty of Lausanne, islands which were, however, definitely given to the latter country by the Pact of London. Further to the South-east the Italians certainly have a less good claim to a Mandate for the Adalia region than have the Greeks to Smyrna. Indeed as no shadow of an argument exists upon the nationality basis, that claim depends upon special rights and interests largely self-assumed and self-imposed by Italy—a claim unfortunately recognised by England, France and Russia, at the time of her entry into the war. Under such circumstances it seems to me that whilst so far as commercial enterprises are concerned Italy may be entitled to a specially favoured position, any mandate secured by her should be confined to a strictly limited area. Such a mandate should not, I think, in any case include the direct or indirect protection of the areas to remain nominally or really Turkish.

Beyond saying that the Turkish flag might be maintained, I have, heretofore, carefully refrained from any reference to the system of government with which the several new States should be endowed or to the binding power to exist between them. Subject to any conditions laid down by the League of Nations, the first of these questions must naturally depend upon the Mandatories. They will have to provide High Commissioners, instructors for the police, and advisers in all the public departments, and especially in those responsible for finance and justice. So far as the second problem is concerned, whilst I agree with Sir Theodore Morison* that the rights and sentiments of the Moslem world ought not to be forgotten, I hardly think that "the creation of a sort of United States of

* See a letter published in *The Times* on May 14th, 1919.

Islam" is practical, for, failing the "Federal" Government being *completely* under foreign influence, it would not be possible to leave in its hands the control of the army and of the navy, and the collection of the taxes necessary to pay for "imperial" requirements. It seems to me, therefore, unless the United States were willing to accept a general supervisory mandate for all Turkey, thus rendering possible the above solution, in addition to undertaking special mandates for the Straits and for Armenia, that the only alternative is to limit the binding force to the establishment of a customs union, to the maintenance of a single (an Ottoman) monetary and postal system, and to a unification of or moulding of the law so that in future it may be administered according to one, or at most, two systems.

This question of justice and of the law is fundamental and far-reaching, for however possible may be the reform of the Turk in other directions, I do not believe that he can ever be regenerated as a judge, and especially as a judge in cases where non-Turks, and particularly Christians, are concerned. Moreover, whatever may be the subdivisions of the Ottoman Empire, no arrangement made by the Peace Conference can do away with the mixture of races and of religions which must continue, or avoid the necessity of establishing absolute equality before the law for minorities and majorities, for Christians and for Moslems. And, in addition, there is the condition so well explained by Sir Charles Eliot in his book upon Turkey, created by the co-existence of two or three (I would say, four) systems of jurisprudence—a condition to be inherited by any newly created States unless measures are taken to terminate it. There is the Sheri or religious law, which may be applied in the case of Moslems to all transactions, and which governs all questions of real property, whatever may be the nationality or religion of the litigants interested. Corresponding with this are the privileges vested in the various Christian Chiefs and the ecclesiastical Courts which have powers to deal with questions of marriage, divorce, and inheritance among the members of their own "Millet" or Community. On the other hand, there is the general civil law, based upon the Code Napoléon, which is applicable to Moslems as well as to Christians, and which is meted out by a series of Courts depending upon the Ministry of Justice. And last, but not least, there are the Capitulations, the origin and meaning of which are simply but fully explained by Sir Edwin Pears in "The Fall of Constantinople." These privileges, enjoyed by foreigners until after their abrogation by the Turks in September, 1914—an abrogation never recognised by the Allies—endowed them with extra-territorial rights. They thus created a body of law which cannot be upset by the Turks, or (if Egypt is to be taken as an example) by any other Power without the consent of the signatories to the various treaties in which they are embodied.

In the past this state of things has been highly unsatisfactory to all parties, except perhaps to the foreigner. Whilst justice has been non-existent in the Ottoman Courts, and whilst the Turks, particularly the Young Turks, have been endeavouring to abrogate the Christian privileges, the Christians have tried to shelter them-

selves behind these privileges and to claim their protection in cases to which they do not apply. In the future a like situation would be even more disastrous, for the difficulty of carrying out a multiple system in a number of States would be far greater than that existing in its application in a single, highly centralised Empire. To mitigate this difficulty it seems to me, therefore, that there may be two alternatives. The adoption of the first would carry with it the maintenance of more or less the same system, together with the Capitulations, but the native courts in each area would have to be placed under foreign supervision and the rights of minorities in the various States would have to be safeguarded and strictly enforced.

Such an arrangement would not, however, be satisfactory, for it would leave the way open for the creation of diverse systems by the different mandatories. This development would be highly disadvantageous, partly because, for many years to come, populations and even families will be so mixed and divided that numerous cases, affected partly by conditions prevailing in one area and partly in another, must arise. Consequently it would be preferable to evolve a new judicial system, applicable alike to all the autonomies or independent States. If this were done, although it might be necessary, for obvious reasons, to accept the Sheri Law for cases directly concerned with the Moslem creed, and to allow the Christian Churches or Communities to have jurisdiction in purely religious matters, the Capitulations should be done away with, and a civil code, probably the Code Napoléon, made applicable to all the inhabitants, irrespective of their religion, race, or nationality. But if foreigners are to continue to go to or to reside in what was Turkey with that confidence which is necessary to the development of the country, and if natives, be they Turks, Arabs, Kurds, Armenians, Greeks, or the representatives of any other nationality are to enjoy the personal security to which they are entitled, measures would then have to be taken not so much to establish the law upon a proper basis, as to see that it is fairly administered. For this purpose, therefore, provision should be made for the foreign supervision of Summary Tribunals, in cases where such supervision may be necessary, and for the constitution of mixed Higher Courts, composed partly of natives and partly of foreigners, these latter being furnished by the Mandatory Powers responsible for the different areas. It is only by such safeguards that the uncertainty and the ill-feeling engendered by centuries of misgovernment can be obliterated, and that the predominating races in the respective zones can be prevented from venting their animosity upon others who, whatever happens, must continue to be what amount to their subject nationalities.

In the foregoing pages I have endeavoured merely to place before my readers some of the conditions and considerations which influence the destiny of what was the Ottoman Empire. The information available is so scanty, the factors in the situation are so manifold and the difficulties of the problem so multitudinous, that it is impossible to be dogmatic or positive as to the future. All that we really know is that the terms of the Armistice, granted by the

Allies to Turkey, are such as to place her completely in our hands, and, therefore, to enable us, militarily speaking, to impose upon her whatever terms may seem desirable to the Peace Conference. On the other hand, it must be obvious to the most casual observer that the position occupied, in the world of Islam, by the Sultan and his people places them in a unique category among our enemies, and that, if the future peace of the world is to be assured, it is necessary by bringing the numerous international agreements actually in existence into line with the principles for which we have been fighting, to work for, not a vindictive but a real settlement. No such settlement can be attained by local consent, and no satisfactory means can, I think, be devised for enabling the various nationalities or districts to have an immediate voice in the selection of the Mandatory Power destined to assist in their government. It seems to me, therefore, especially as all the peoples concerned have confidence in the disinterestedness of the United States, that the question of the solution or non-solution of the Eastern problem depends upon the ability or inability of the European Allies to persuade that country to undertake a general mandate for what was Turkey, or at least to become responsible for the *régimes* to be established on the Straits and in Armenia. It is for this reason that we must still live in hope that Mr. Wilson, who has preached and created the "Great Ideal"—the League of Nations, may yet be able to persuade his fellow citizens to undertake responsibilities, the acceptance or refusal of which is destined certainly to further, or perhaps to foil, the establishment of that freedom and justice for which our two Commonwealths have fought side by side. We appreciate the feelings which make many people in the United States favour a return to that position of "splendid isolation" heretofore occupied by their country, and we value the sentiments of modesty possessed by those who resent the prominent position occupied by their diplomacy in Paris. But we know our own limitations and difficulties perhaps better than they are known upon the other side of the Atlantic, and we therefore trust that, as came the answer to a call which entailed sacrifice of life and limb, so will come a response, a going forward and a co-operation of America and of Great Britain—a response without which we cannot hold the common stewardship for the liberties of mankind.

H. CHARLES WOODS.

May 21st.

SOUTH AFRICA : A GOLDEN OPPORTUNITY.

IN South Africa the storm cloud is already very much bigger than a man's hand; whether it will give way to a blue sky and a sunlit future or continue to darken Britain's horizon until it bursts with all the fury of blood-red civil war depends upon British statecraft. If British statesmen can catch the vision of a United States of South Africa, within the confines of which there shall be "equal opportunities for all civilised men," then bright and glorious is the future of that country; if not, catastrophe as certain as terrible will speedily overtake us. There are three main groups of warring elements South of the Zambesi involving several deep-seated causes of unrest, either one of which may at any moment precipitate a disaster. The cardinal fact for the British public is that the present situation is becoming intolerable: something big must be done, and done quickly, if a catastrophe is to be averted.

The first group of warring elements is mainly political:—Within the Union it is Nationalist *versus* Britisher, without the Union it is the Rhodesian people *versus* the Chartered Company. The second group is economic, namely, organised white labour *versus* native labour, and the white landowners *versus* the native. The third and possibly most dangerous group is racial, Boer *versus* British, both *versus* African, besides Indian and Malay *versus* whites.

The root cause of this unrest which is growing everywhere between the Zambesi and Cape Agulhas is prevailing injustice which, poisoning the springs of human relationships, stalks with menacing gesture through the land, setting race against race and class against class. A close and well-known student of the local situation recently wrote from Cape Colony:—

"It is difficult for the home people to interpret the hostility of the Dutch against the English, which General Hertzog, Malan and Co. are striving to fan into flames. Nor can it be understood until it is realised that at the back of it all lies the question of the treatment of the native and coloured populations. . . . The Boer considers that manual labour is to the white man a degradation, but the distinctly allotted portion of the black. He believes that by his membership of the elect white race he has a claim upon Providence for free support at the expense of the native. Therefore he must be in a position to compel the native to work for him. . . ."

"Economic causes are now aggravating this longing (for a republic), for since the Boers will not work as a race, they are sinking into debt, and their farms are steadily passing out of their hands. Where they starve, the English grow rich through industry, and to the ignorant Dutch, all these mortgages and forced sales are the fault of the British, who will not let them treat the native 'properly.' Therefore the British must go!"

This Dutch hostility is difficult to understand, for every liberty is accorded to the Dutch except that of being given a free hand with the native. British opinion will not readily forget that the only tangible reason given by De Wet for rebelling was that he had been fined five shillings for flogging a native! Nationalism, we

are told, is growing to the point of actual danger, but this is not all, for before very long it will be reinforced by kindred souls across the Orange River. The forty thousand or so "Free Staters" on the electorate roll will, as they know, find their ranks reinforced in the no distant future by the major part of the ten thousand adult males across the Orange River in German South West Africa—an accession of strength which will go a long way towards counter-balancing the Natal vote. British statesmanship then should reckon with a very considerable increase in the strength of the "Two Streamers," as General Hertzog and his followers are called.

THE RHODESIAN TANGLE.

In Rhodesia the warring elements divide themselves into two main groups:—pro-Company and anti-Company. The pro-Company following is composed mainly of those—and they are the majority—who are employed either directly by the Chartered Company or indirectly in one of its many "demi-semi-quaver," companies. The anti-Charter or People's Party, to give it the official title, has for its foremost plank in policy that of terminating the Company's administration at the earliest possible moment. But unity does not go beyond that of ending Chartered rule, for the People's Party, despite outward appearances, is divided between the desirability of "Crown Colony," "Responsible," and "Union" Government. The left wing is anxious for incorporation in the Union, others prefer a Crown Colony administration for an interregnum; but for the moment unity has been secured under the banner of Sir Charles Coghlan and for Responsible Government as a refuge for the growing forces against the Chartered Company.

In the Rhodesian situation British statesmanship has one solid advantage, namely, that in the event of incorporation in the Union there would be an all-British vote of nearly eight thousand. That advantage can be relied upon unless by folly or weakness Rhodesian sentiment is outraged by the Imperial Government agreeing to pay the shareholders of the Chartered Company something between £7,500,000 and £12,000,000 to cover its wars upon the unfortunate Matabele, the still more unfortunate Mashonas, and a host of administrative deficits which, since the days of the South Sea Bubble, have always characterised Colonial expansion by Chartered Companies. Rhodesians are determined that a gift of millions to the shareholders of the British South Africa Company shall never be tied round their necks in the shape of a public debt.

THE INDIAN COLONISTS.

In British Africa, south of the Zambesi, there are from 150,000 to 200,000 British Indians, who are still suffering from palpable grievances and persistent injustice. In the major part of the Union these law-abiding British citizens, many of whom are highly educated, are denied both Parliamentary and Municipal franchise. In Cape Colony and Natal franchise disabilities imposed upon the British Indian, as in the case of the native, are less severe than in

the Transvaal and the Orange Free State. The same discrimination is shown with regard to the land. It is only in the Cape and Natal that British Indians are allowed to own fixed property registered in their own names. This attitude of hostility towards British Indians finds expression also in racial disabilities over their trading licences, which place the Indian at a serious and perpetual disadvantage as compared with white commercial interests. To these political and industrial disabilities there is added the irritating social ostracism which denies to the Indian any equality in the public means of transport.

THE WAY OF SALVATION.

The real menace to South African peace is the native position. The only way of salvation is along the road of justice to the 5,000,000 natives. This is far more than a question of Black *versus* White, for the prevailing injustice is poisoning the spring of all relationship, as between white and white, and as between white and African or Indian. It is because there can be no real peace in South Africa until the broad lines of justice between the races are firmly laid, that true statecraft must begin with the people and with the land of South Africa. The situation is the more tragic because the golden moment is now, and because there is as yet no sign that British statecraft is alive to the splendour of the vision!

How low the British name has fallen in South Africa is pretty clear when deliberately and in the open Courts an admitted discrimination along colour lines is practised, and when, as the other day, a solicitor was violently mobbed in the streets by white men for attending the Court to defend professionally a prisoner in the dock! When this can happen, Britain is not far from another John Brown of Harper's Ferry. The African south of the Zambesi is the victim to-day of three capital forms of injustice—industrial helotry, insecurity of land tenure, and political ostracism.

INDUSTRIAL HELOTRY.

Ten years ago the fiercest criticism was directed against the mine owners of the Rand. Statistics and reports were produced which placed the owners of the gold mines in a very unenviable light. To-day the native appears to have few grievances against the mine owners, but a terrible hatred against organised white labour is seizing upon the native mind. The reason for this growing antipathy is that the trade unions of South Africa deny to the native the right to rise in the industrial scale, and insist upon keeping all natives to the position of hewers of wood and drawers of water.

The year 1918 has witnessed developments which must bring a flush of shame to every Britisher—developments so extreme that they have come as a shock to the best opinion in South Africa. In July last the Federation of Trades presented to the Chambers of Mines an ultimatum from the miners demanding the dismissal within thirty days of all coloured drill sharpeners. This action

by organised white labour has made a profound impression in South Africa, for it is a declaration of war upon the coloured people.

By this outrageous action, democratic labour organisations have driven into the arms of the natives hundreds of thousands of men in whose ranks are to be found potential leaders of the type of Booker Washington, or even military commanders of the type of Toussaint Louverture. This attitude on the part of organised labour is the more deplorable when it is remembered that the coloured or half-caste people of South Africa are the sons of the very fathers who now deny industrial freedom to their offspring, who, after all, are only in this world through the debauchery of African womanhood.

The second development in the industrial world is due to the flaming injustice of last May and June. The European workmen at the Power Station in Johannesburg declared a strike for higher wages, with the result that the whole motive and lighting power ceased throughout the district; the object of this strike was that of securing an increased wage to meet the increased cost of living. The Town Council thereupon agreed to an increase of wages to about £8 per week. The native employees of the same Corporation, suffering from the same increased cost of living, but only receiving about £1 per week, failing to obtain any advance, followed the example set by their fellow employees, and one hundred and fifty-two struck work. The white strikers received all their demands, but the natives were at once arrested and sentenced to two months hard labour, coupled with the following admonition by the Magistrate, who said:—

“ They would go back to their work as soon as the necessary arrangements could be made. They would be placed under a guard, including a guard of Zulus with assegais, and white men with guns. If they attempted to escape they would be shot down if necessary, and if they refused to obey any orders which might be given them, they would receive lashes.”

British public opinion must realise that this sort of thing means war, for, as Mr. Balmforth said at a public meeting recently in Cape Town unless this attitude is promptly reversed “ We shall be faced with a war between blacks and whites. That is the position to which we are drifting.” The immediate effect of this condition of affairs was electric, mass meetings of natives were held everywhere demanding the release of the imprisoned strikers and a general increase of 1s. per day for native labour.

Lord Buxton and General Botha met the situation by immediately releasing the imprisoned strikers and instructing Mr. Moffat to undertake an enquiry into the cause of the unrest amongst the natives. Mr. Moffat's report, like that of Mr. H. O. Buckle in the spring of 1914, was a grave warning; there was, he said, “ a lack of confidence ” amongst the natives in the Government, that the natives felt that since the Act of Union, legislation had tended to perpetuate their position as the subject race. Mr. Moffat also

pointed out that "so long as natives are denied the rights of citizenship . . . there can be no real contentment in the country."

The grievances which the natives suffer in the industrial world owing to the colour bar are (1) The bar to advancement, (2) Inadequacy of wages, (3) Pass laws. There are no less than seven whole groups of industrial positions forbidden to the natives by the Mine Workers Union because, and only because, of the colour of the men's skin! To this fundamental disability in the industrial world there is all the irritation of the racial Pass laws, the inequality of compensation for mining diseases, accidents and death. Thus a situation is created which it is generally recognised may at any moment lead to a catastrophe. A moment's reflection will demonstrate this great potential danger in the Transvaal. Along that twenty-eight miles of gold reef there is crowded a mass of nearly two hundred and fifty thousand workers, black of skin but moved with the same sentiments, desires and passions as the operatives of any other industrial area in the world. These sons of Africa have for years been kept loyal by their intense affection for and confidence in British administrative justice. That bond of loyalty is breaking asunder, and these men of Zululand, Bechuanaland and Basutoland are being driven by social ostracism, industrial and political injustice into a solid but seething mass of discontent. Missionaries' and Commissioners' reports have told but one story which may be summed up in the words—Let no time be lost, for at any moment a lighted match may fall and set up such a flame all along the Reef that none will be able to quench it!

THE LAND MENACE.

Those twin means of oppression—labour and land—are nowhere more acute than throughout South Africa. There was a moment in 1913 when a permanent settlement of the land question seemed possible. General Botha introduced and carried in the South African Parliament, and secured Royal consent to his great scheme of land separation between the white and coloured people of South Africa. The natives who were most concerned formally stated that if the measure were fairly carried out they made no protest against the principle, thus small blame attaches to them for the fact that the situation has grown steadily worse. The principle of the Act of 1913 was not racial segregation but a separation of land into white and black holdings coupled with the priceless boon of absolute security to the native races of all lands allotted to them. But the fatal blot in the whole measure was that two hundred and sixty million acres were to be placed at the disposal of the million whites, whilst only forty million acres, and that not of the best, were to be allocated to the natives. It is true that Commission followed Commission for the purpose of examining the proposed native areas, but this and the delay due to the war gave opportunity for both criticism and misrepresentation to flourish and propaganda by the whites to spread throughout the territory, with the result that the operations of the 1913 Act and its successive and dependent measures are all held up, and it seems to be generally agreed that

these measures cannot now be applied. Meantime the land question is becoming as great a menace to South African peace as the sleeping industrial volcano along the Reef.

COMMONWEALTH OR SLAVE EMPIRE?

Thus to the British people there comes to-day the call for a great decision. South Africa once again puts the test and once again there comes the summons to choose between Liberty and Slavery. Is South Africa to be consolidated through the bonds of a Commonwealth which knows no colour bar in justice, industry, and religion, or will South African peace be wrecked upon the pernicious doctrine of the Transvaal Grondwet which declares that there can be no equality in Church or State between White and Black?

The world population to-day is roughly 1,600 millions, and of this world population over 430,000,000 live under the protecting flag of Great Britain. But the first cardinal fact for every British subject is that the British Empire is a coloured Empire, for out of that total of 430,000,000 British subjects over 350,000,000 are coloured. The second cardinal fact is that at present the colour bar, whilst in theory non-existent in British policy, not merely exists in practice, but is everywhere growing in the intensity of its discrimination. It may be argued that the democratic States of North America, equally with Great Britain, preach against, but in practice uphold, the colour bar; this is undoubtedly true; but it is surely something gained that both are now professedly against colour discriminations. There is, however, one vital distinction, namely, that the United States, with its population of 100,000,000, including only 10,000,000 coloured, is predominantly white, whereas the British Empire is overwhelmingly coloured. It is this fact which makes both urgent and grave the South African situation, where Britain's action upon the question of the colour bar will be the turning point in the history of the British expansion. We must either progress along the path of a real Commonwealth of nations or drift along the downward path of a slave Empire to certain dissolution.

THE WAY OF LIFE.

Taking South Africa not merely as the most urgent problem, but as the key position, what can British statesmanship do? First it can proclaim once again that what Sir Charles Bruce calls "The Broad Stone of Empire" means that wherever the British flag flies, there all men, regardless of race, religion, or colour, shall enjoy liberty of conscience and equality of opportunity in Church, State, Commerce, and Industry. The first political step would be to set before the world the truly grand spectacle of a United States of South Africa, comprising all territories south of the Zambesi, with an area exceeding 1,100,000 square miles, or more than five times the size of the German Empire, and a population of nearly 7,000,000 inhabitants. The people of South Africa would surely make a sacrifice of petty personal antipathies in order to secure the consummation of such an attractive future.

The first practical step would then be the amendment of the South African Act of Union, enlarging the Senate and the Assembly, extending the franchise from the Atlantic to the Indian Ocean and from the Cape of Good Hope to Victoria Falls. But the one vital reform upon which everything turns is the expurgation of the colour bar from the Act. In a weak moment the British Parliament in 1909, to its everlasting disgrace, allowed the insertion of the colour bar over the major part of the Union territories. This was done as a sop to the backvelde Boers in order to retain their loyalty. Like every other bribe it has recoiled with all the fury of a boomerang and recoiled with increased velocity, for not only has it failed utterly to retain the loyalty of 50,000 backvelders, it has done more in ten years to sap the loyalty of 5,000,000 natives than all other concrete injustices rolled into one.

British statesmanship possesses in South Africa to-day intensely loyal elements; the best thought is on the side of justice, peace, and progress. All that is best amongst British, Boer, and "Peruvian" will be on the side of the statesman bold enough and strong enough to set before South Africa the vision of a united sub-Continent and a reformed Constitution which rests upon the same broad basis in every respect as the Mother Country. But if British statecraft, lacking moral courage and political insight, fails South Africa to-day and panders to expediency, nothing will save those 7,000,000 people—white, coloured, and African—from the dread catastrophe of civil war.

JOHN H. HARRIS.

THE EMPLOYMENT OF THE WAR DISABLED.

LAST November a strike of somewhat unusual character broke out in a London tobacco warehouse. Two disabled soldiers had been discharged and their fellow-workmen struck work to secure their reinstatement. The employers argued that by reason of their wounds the soldiers were not able to do their work properly; the men, on the other hand, maintained that the disability had been incurred not in a private but in a public cause, the defence of which had benefited the employers as well as others, and therefore that the disability should not fall on the men alone, but should be shared with the employers. The strikers won, and the men were reinstated. Both parties to the dispute were right. The employers were right in urging that it was unfair that they should be subjected to a special handicap in competition with their rivals by the employment of men who were not in every respect efficient. The men were right in maintaining that the burden of the injury done in public service should be distributed. From the arguments used on either side in this strike we may deduce two principles. First, that employers must help their men to carry the disabilities imposed by the war; and, secondly, that the burdens of this obligation should be evenly distributed not only between employer and workpeople, but also between employer and employer. That, at any rate, would seem to be the only basis on which the claims of the two parties to the strike can be equitably reconciled.

The employers in the tobacco warehouse were probably men of average humanity and of average sense of public duty. They did nothing in discharging the disabled soldiers that most other employers would not have done, too, under the same circumstances. Unless, therefore, the problem of employing disabled soldiers is taken seriously in hand, we shall in a few years see the same sights in our streets as saddened the hearts of humane and patriotic men after our former wars—the same human wreckage, but vastly more of it, as the damage caused by this war is vastly greater than that of any of its predecessors. Mr. Galsworthy has recently expressed, with his spare, blunt eloquence, the fears that haunt the conscience of every humane man. “Do people realise,” he has written, “what a dreadful thing it would be if all the butter of fair words about our heroes melts into one vast disfiguring grease spot; and, instead of men honoured and contented, we have an army of broken wanderers with curses on their lips? There had better be no illusion Every such broken, cursing man will be in the right and we in the wrong of it, and the strife and disruption they will breed will be deserved.” If these men, broken in our wars, are left to the buffetting of economic laws, there is no excuse for ignorance as to what the result will be. They will not have the chance of surviving in the struggle. Their wreckage will be a disgrace and a source of permanent danger to industrial and political peace. For remember the conditions under which this war was begun and

waged. It came suddenly on the people, and whereas in former wars there was usually some period of education in the nature of the issues, in this there was none. But never for a moment did the people doubt where their duty lay. They sacrificed everything to the cause, not so much of safety as of justice. The privilege of being exempt from compulsory military service, which they justly regarded as their most distinctive heritage as an island people; the rules for the protection of their labour, which the people had built up as the result of a generation of agitation; the peace and contentment of hundreds of thousands of homes, many of the safeguards of individual liberty—all were sacrificed, freely and almost without murmur, to a conception of international justice. But they were not sacrificed without mental reserves, and the chief of these was that if justice was worth fighting for in international affairs it was even more precious at home. And on the degree in which we satisfy that sense of justice in home affairs will depend the peaceful and orderly development of our society. Everything, therefore, is at stake—our honour as a nation and our internal union and progress—in this settlement of the problem of our disabled soldiers and sailors.

This duty was long ago acknowledged by the Government. In 1915 a Committee was appointed under the chairmanship of Sir George Murray, to consider and report "upon the methods to be adopted for providing employment for soldiers and sailors disabled during the war." This Committee, in its report, laid down the principle that the care of the disabled is a duty that should be assumed by the State, and added that this duty should include the restoration of the man's health where practicable, the provision of training facilities if he desires to learn a new trade, and the finding of employment for him when he stands in need of such assistance. The first of these duties is being discharged with singular thoroughness, for of all the triumphs of this war none has been so complete—at any rate, so far as the Western theatre of war is concerned—as that of the medical service. The second of these duties—namely, training disabled men in new trades—has been attempted, though it is to be feared with much less pretence to completeness, in the Lord Roberts' workshops; but it is hard to teach an old dog new tricks, and such figures as are available show that our disabled men do not take very readily to the learning of a new trade. From April 1st to September 17th last year 134,013 soldiers had their pension claims admitted; the number of men admitted to training in the same period was 6,200. These figures enormously increase the urgency of the third duty recognised by Sir George Murray's Committee—namely, the duty of finding employment for the disabled men. The Committee, reporting in 1915, when the size of our armies was comparatively small and long before conscription was introduced, added the proviso "when he stands in need of such assistance" to its declaration of the State's duty to find him employment. It is now evident, and all signs of approaching storm in the Labour market point in the same direction, that he will need this assistance in the vast majority of cases. While the war was in progress labour was so scarce that no man had a difficulty in finding

work if he wanted it. Already we see sinister signs of the approaching change. But this duty of finding employment was for long almost completely neglected by the Government.

It was not for lack of warning. Sir George Murray's Committee had suggested appeals to employers as one way in which the Government's duty of finding employment for the disabled might be discharged, and although the Government made no such appeals a number of private persons made suggestions or produced schemes with that as their chief object. Of these schemes, that of Mr. Rothband, a manufacturer of Pendleton, Manchester, was the most important. Originally propounded in a letter to Sir George Murray's Committee, it triumphed by his insistent advocacy and by its intrinsic merits over indifference and opposition, and, out of several starters, was the only one to reach the end of the war. It was taken up by an extremely powerful Committee of both Houses of Parliament, and on November 5th last it was actually accepted by the then Ministers of Pensions and Labour. On that date a deputation of the Parliamentary Committee was given quite clearly to understand that the appeal advocated in the scheme would be issued in the names of the Prime Minister, the Minister of Pensions, and the Minister of Labour. An appeal was issued on March 14, and signed by the Prime Minister; and though this appeal was not the whole Rothband scheme, it embodied one of his ideas. The success of the appeal, in the writer's opinion, depends on its embodying the rest.

What, stated in the briefest and most summary form, are the leading ideas of the Rothband scheme? They are these: (1) An appeal is to be issued by the highest national authority, inviting all employers who are willing to employ disabled men to send in their names to be registered. (2) These names are to be inscribed on a Roll of Honour. (3) They are to be printed on a permanent record, kept up to date and circulated throughout the country, especially amongst Labour Exchanges and employment agencies, and issued periodically, much like a telephone directory. Into the administrative details of the scheme it is not necessary to enter. The main points about the scheme are that it is national and universal, that it creates a permanent obligation, which is on permanent record, that it would be approximately just between one employer and another, and that it makes the obligation on employers to render this State service an obligation of honour, as it should be. The appeal issued by Mr. Lloyd George in March is national, and it is admirably phrased. But it is defective in that it leaves out all the provisions for registration in a Roll of Honour. It acknowledges the obligation; it provides no machinery for securing its satisfaction. It fires, but fires blank and over the heads of employers.

It is common ground that the men disabled in the war have a right to employment, and that they will not get this employment if they are left to fend for themselves in the labour market. The Government, therefore, must do something. As Mr. Galsworthy has pointed out, there are three ways and only three, in which this employment can be found. Either (1) the Government must itself be the employer and establish all over the country a system of

Government workshops for townsmen and of rural colonies for countrymen; or (2) the Government must compel private employers to employ by some measure of employment conscription on those who have employment to offer; or, lastly (3), the Government must make it an obligation of honour on employers to employ disabled men. The first scheme was tentatively suggested by Mr. Galsworthy himself in the pages of *Reveille*, but nothing has been heard of it since. The second scheme has been suggested several times in official speeches, but never worked out into specific proposals. The third is the Rothband scheme, which has been worked out in considerable detail, and has received a surprising measure of support from manufacturers and business men. If the voluntary principle is to be saved at all, it can only be by the Rothband scheme. And yet, from another point of view, this distinction between the voluntary principle and compulsion is misleading. The real difference between the schemes is in the nature of the compulsion to be applied. The Rothband scheme would establish moral compulsion; in the other case there would be legal compulsion. The main question is which of these two forms of compulsion is the best adapted to secure the desired ends with the minimum of friction. After all, we must not speak of employment as though it were a mere commodity. It is a mutual relationship between human beings, made of the stuff of human nature, and, whatever scheme is adopted, it must inevitably fail unless it satisfies this human equation.

A word may be said at the outset on the suggestion that the State should itself be the employer. Its authors are surely sanguine in thinking that these Government industries would be self-supporting, manned as they would be exclusively by the disabled. It is more probable that they would be run at a loss; and in addition there would be a great difficulty in housing the workmen and their families. The cost to the State would be heavy, and if the industries were competitive to private concerns, as they might very well be, the less they lost and the nearer they came to paying their way the less they would be liked. The probability is that in order to escape this unpopularity the State would be content to run its workshops and farm colonies at a loss. This loss might well be cheerfully accepted if only the problem of employment for disabled soldiers were solved thereby. Justice and humanity are things of which one does not count the cost. But would it solve the problem? To begin with, the nature of the employment could not be so varied as it would be if the whole range of private industry were open to the disabled. Under the most favourable circumstances there would be a large residue of men left over who would find the employment offered in the Government workshops and colonies unsuitable. There would, too, be a great waste of the special abilities that the disabled ex-soldiers had acquired in their former occupations and for which there would be no use in the new Government jobs. Moreover, these workshops and colonies, existing solely for disabled men, not being part of the normal industry of the country, would in effect be "segregations" of men. They would be "institutions," to which objection is rightly taken,

and in so far as they did not pay their way, "charitable" institutions at that. It is these things, not the nature of the treatment received within, that make the difference between normal and "charitable" industry. These workshops and colonies might become unpopular, not only with private employers, but with the workpeople themselves, and to that extent would fail to solve the problem that we have at heart. As it is, the shyness of disabled soldiers towards the existing training workshops is very remarkable and very regrettable. By all means let us encourage the disabled to avail themselves of the special training given by Government in Lord Roberts' workshops. But when we have done everything, we shall find the bulk of disabled soldiers attempting to get back to their old jobs and their old work, and, if these are barred to them by the absence of some scheme of ensuring them private employment, drifting into the ranks of the unemployed and later of the unemployable.

No definite scheme of employment conscription on employers has yet been produced, but there would seem to be two fatal objections to any scheme involving legal compulsion. In the first place, the employers would not stand it. The rules and regulations of D.O.R.A. acquiesced in during war would not be tolerated under peace conditions. Secondly, although you can make an employer pay wages to a man, you cannot make a man work unless he wants. The effect on the employed would be very bad. It would place them in a position to say to the employers who have been compelled to employ them: "Oh, you say you are not satisfied with your workmen and don't think we are worth our wages, do you? Well, just remember please that you have *got* to have us here whether you like it or not. If you are not satisfied, that is a matter for you to settle with *your* master, the State." Once you establish legal compulsion, it would only be human nature for men, none of them perhaps in the best of health and all suffering from some sort of disability, to use that argument, and the existence of this class of workmen in a factory would be a source of demoralisation, and at a time when the whole future of our industry depends on getting the best and the hardest work out of everybody, would tend to lower the standard and relax the fibre of industrial energy. It would pay the employers under these circumstances to discharge all the disabled men, even if they have to pay their wages. Thus the disabled men would become pensioners living in idleness and a prey to the vices of idleness. There is no means by which a one-sided compulsion on employers to employ could be made to work. If there is to be legal compulsion, it would in fairness have to be compulsion on both sides, compulsion to work as well as compulsion to employ. But how are you to force men to work if there is no sanction, no penalty for not working?

The objections raised to the voluntary scheme or to the scheme of moral compulsion (it does not matter which way we put it) proposed by Mr. Rothband may now be briefly considered. It is said (1) that it would probably not absorb all the disabled. But what conceivable scheme could guarantee that it would take all the disabled men? Not a scheme of legal compulsion, unless, indeed,

you forced the men to work and thus created a class of quasi-indentured labour. Not a system of Government workshops, for these would not have the same variety of work to offer, and in any case could not force men to stay in them against their will. The objection that no voluntary system would absorb all the disabled men applies with equal force to any other system, and perhaps with even greater force, because under a voluntary scheme in which employment were given as an obligation of honour the master would take a personal interest in the disabled soldiers whom he employed.

(2) It is objected, again, that many employers would join the roll, get the *kudos*, and shirk the obligation by taking one or two disabled men where they should be taking ten or twenty. But, if necessary, a *pro-rata* scale could be laid down of the number to be taken by each employer. Such a scale would not necessarily be inconsistent with the voluntary character of the scheme. Some industries, from their very nature, might have more openings for disabled men than other industries, and in such cases an employer who could not employ his proportion might be allowed to commute employment by the payment of a tax *per capita*. This tax might be paid to the State and go to the support of State trading workshops. Or, instead of a flat rate we might have a rate varying in different employments. In any case, in proportion as we established a moral obligation on employers to employ the disabled, we should defeat the temptation to evade it, and the publication in the Roll of the proportion of disabled men employed by each employer would also operate in the same direction.

(3) It is urged, again, that employers might be inclined to put even those disabled men, who were capable of better work into "blind-alley" jobs. But why should they if the men showed that they were "capable of better work"? Surely it would be to their own interests to keep them in such work and to help them even to improvement in it. The experience of several employers who take a personal interest in their workpeople is that the disabled men whom they have employed get on very well with better work, and after no long interval become quite equal to the able-bodied workers. But that is precisely because, apart from the wages they can earn, they know that their positions are somewhat precarious, and they are keen not to lose them. They know better even than employers how they are handicapped in the competition of the labour market, and will therefore be extra anxious to keep good jobs. But establish compulsion on the employer, and you take away all incentive to the man to better himself, and, therefore, for the employer to assist him in bettering himself. If the power and the will to better himself is in the man the voluntary system will best bring it out, but if it is not there to be brought out, surely it is better for a disabled man to get inferior jobs such as Mr. Galsworthy enumerates than live idly on his pension. Some regular employment is better than none.

Lastly (4), it is objected that if the disabled soldier knew for certain that there was a light protected job of some sort always open for the asking, he would in very many cases refuse re-training for special work. This objection obviously applies in a much stronger

degree to a system of compulsion, unless, of course, it were also proposed to make the system of special training compulsory. After all, the light protected jobs will be very limited in number, and probably soon filled up, and therefore necessity and self-interest will compel the majority of disabled men to seek the better, higher-class jobs. Of these latter, if employers will do their duty patriotically, there will be an abundant supply, if not sufficient to absorb all the disabled. By all means persuade as many as you can to train for special pursuits, but you will find this a very much more difficult task than persuading men to go back to their former trade or to take up work in which they know that tens of thousands are already successfully engaged in earning a competent living.

Mr. Galsworthy doubts whether any plan would cover the whole ground and clear the country's conscience, and he thinks that a combination of compulsion with the Rothband scheme, and with a system of national workshops and colonies, may be necessary. Mr. Galsworthy may be right. It may ultimately be found impossible to preserve the voluntary principle without a *pro-rata* principle, and some system under which employers who evade or are unable to discharge their moral obligation are subject to a special tax. You may call that disguised compulsion if you like. But what is certain is that no system of compulsion pure and simple will work at all. The foundation of your scheme must be voluntary and rest on moral obligation, whatever superstructure you raise upon it, and it is this binding moral obligation that it has from the first been the object of the Rothband scheme to create. Had the scheme been set working two years ago the moral obligation would have been felt more strongly than now. But even now the Rothband scheme would seem to be the indispensable beginning of any attempt by the State to discharge its duty to disabled men.

H. SIDEBOTHAM.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN'S AFTER-WAR BUDGET.

FOR, surely, such it may be called, as it is supposed to provide for a period which extends to the 31st March, 1920—some sixteen months after the armistice of the 11th November, 1918. I propose to give a general account of Mr. Austen Chamberlain's Budget, its provisions generally, but throughout assuming the obvious and important fact that it is a Budget for a year after the war.

From the Treasury point of view, the financial year 1918-19 had been a quite successful year, Mr. Bonar Law having estimated for a revenue of £842,000,000, and receipts reached £889,000,000; while the expenditure, which had been estimated at £2,977,000,000, proved to be £2,579,000,000 only. The Chancellor's tendency to chuckle cheerfully at that result was proof, perhaps, of departmental complacency, but to the country brought little consolation, seeing how large, after all, the sum spent, and that too atop of all that the war has cost. Moreover, to those who had paid a little attention to such matters, Mr. Chamberlain's self-gratulation brought a recollection and reflection of the millions which had been wasted, and worse, and of which the Treasury control had been, apparently, less than a minus quantity. There is also the important fact to remember that the balance-sheet shows that no less than £1,820,000,000 had been borrowed during the year, reduced by payments of about £151,000,000 to about £1,670,000,000. In this place, especially as the expenditure for war forces was incurred under the war credit votes, nothing further need be said of the expenditure than that £2,918,000,000 had been spent from those credits.

Of the revenue for 1918-19, however, it is worth observing that every avenue of revenue, save estate and other "death" duties, and with some other minor exceptions, had yielded a remarkably prolific sum. The features of the revenue return are the Customs (and Excise in a lesser degree), and the income tax and excess profits duty pre-eminently. Two cautions are necessary, perhaps, in reviewing such a fine yield during the fifth year of war. First, the great revenue is not a proof of great wealth so much as of great sacrifice. The public finance should not be disconnected with private expenditure, which latter, in so many thousand cases, has been on a scale so free—almost lavish—as though the country had been heaping up wealth instead of wasting its substance in war's thankless task. And, secondly, the great yield of income and excess profits taxes, together some £576,000,000 and more, may be estimated better in this paper at a later stage, when Mr. Chamberlain's proposals for the current year come to be considered.

TABLE A.

For 1919-20, Mr. Chamberlain's Final Balance Sheet is estimated thus:—

REVENUE.		£	EXPENDITURE.		£
<i>Customs</i>	117,650,000		National Debt Service		
Addn. proposd.	1,350,000		Fixed Debt Charge ...	29,800,000	
		119,000,000	Outside Do. ...	330,200,000	
<i>Excise</i>	80,900,000			360,000,000	
Addn. proposd.	37,600,000				
		118,500,000	Payments to Local Taxa-		
<i>Estate Duties, &c.</i>	31,000,000		tion	9,763,000	
Net addition ...	2,500,000		Land Settlement ...	5,000,000	
		33,500,000	Other Consol. Fund Ser-		
<i>Stamps</i>		12,000,000	vices	1,832,000	
<i>Land Tax</i>		600,000	On Consol. Fund	376,595,000	
<i>House Duty</i>		1,900,000			
<i>Income Tax</i> (including					
Super Tax)		354,000,000	Army	287,000,000	
Excess Profits Duty, &c.		300,000,000	Navy	149,200,000	
Land Values Duties ...		500,000	Air Force	66,500,000	
			Civil Services ...	£445,804,000	
From Taxes	£940,000,000		Estimates to be		
			presented ...	60,000,000	
Postal Services		30,000,000		505,804,000	
Telegraph „		4,000,000	The Revenue Depart-		
Telephone „		7,000,000	ments	8,537,000	
Crown Lands		650,000	Post Office Services ...	41,274,000	
From Sundry Loans ...		9,750,000			
Miscellaneous		209,700,000	Supply Services	£1,058,315,000	
Non-Tax Revenue	261,100,000				
Total Revenue	£1,201,100,000		Total Expenditure	£1,434,910,000	
Deficit	233,810,000				
	£1,434,910,000		[Expenditure proposed		
			from Capital	£3,484,000]	

A balance sheet of such formidable figures as to make the most case-hardened reader gasp as he considers them—figures for a peaceful year! They call for some comment, founded, of course, on Mr. Chamberlain's speech in submitting them.

The expenditure side of this balance sheet requires notice first, and before entering upon the greater services, a novelty, appearing indeed for the first time, and somewhat in advance of legislation, deserves notice. Under the expenditure from the Consolidated Fund, *i.e.*, expenditure not subject to the annual vote of the House, appears an item, "Land Settlement, £5,000,000," which appears to be a part of the sum which it is proposed shall be lent by the Public Works Loan Commissioners (£20,000,000) to County Councils, &c., to enable them to acquire land for small holdings and the settlement of soldiers, sailors, and others upon them—a sum to be issued within two years of April 1st, 1919. It is to be observed that this sum of £5,000,000 (or the £20,000,000 to be issued under Clause 13 (2) of the Land Settlement Bill now before the House of Commons), though placed down as expenditure for this year, is strictly

a loan ; but under the provisions of the Land Settlement Bill, Clause 23 (3) , may not be returned, but lost in the reduction by 1926 of the value of purchased land.

When we come to the Supply Services, almost each leading head requires a paper to itself, so remarkable are the amounts demanded. For four years the Army and Navy expenditure has appeared in the Budget only as a " token " estimate, and the " Air Force " appears for the first time, and amounts to no less than £66,500,000. The first note to be taken, then, is of the 502.7 million pounds demanded for the fighting services, whereas in 1913-14 the amount spent on them was 77.2 million pounds (or 80.4 million pounds were demanded for 1914-15). That emphasises our distance to-day from the peace-level of expenditure, and touches the vital issues raised by the Budget, and the policy involved. This, however, becomes more impressive still when we turn to the 505.8 million pounds required for Civil Services, a sum equally unprecedented in amount as that for the fighting services. Some £60,000,000 now appear in this last amount for which estimates had not appeared when the Chancellor was speaking ; but he made this extra to total to £65,000,000, made up of £28,000,000 in loans to Allies, £20,000,000 to the Board of Trade for coal indemnities, £8,000,000 for further unemployment benefit, £5,000,000 for Land Settlement (shown in another part of the above table), and £4,000,000 for war bonuses awarded by the Arbitration Board to certain " services "—all items which, doubtless, will attract the attention of committees of the House. Still, there remains the contrast of the charge for " Civil Services : 1913-14 53.9 million pounds ; 1914-15, 56.9 million pounds ; and 505.8 million pounds for 1919-20 ! The reader will easily suspect war charges, and such is the case. For, in addition to increases in consequence of high prices all round, seen also in the increase for Revenue and Postal departments—from £29,000,000 for 1913-14 to 41.2 million pounds for 1919-20—there appear on the Civil Service estimates this year a number of " unclassified " charges, which were borne on the " War Credit " fund at first, and amounting now to no less than 325.4 million pounds. The chief of these special war legacies are the Ministry of Pensions, 72.8 million pounds ; Ministry of Labour (for demobilisation and resettlement), 30.8 million pounds ; loans to Allies (see also above for 28 million pounds), 87.5 million pounds ; railway agreements £60,000,000 ; purchase of housing materials, £7,000,000 ; and the Bread Subsidy, no less than £50,000,000. The total of the supply services, £1,058,000,000, and the total expenditure (including 376.6 million pounds for C Fund Services), which then reaches 1,434.9 million pounds, is only a little better than things in a state of war. It would lead to a wider field than belongs to this paper were it to discuss the policy adopted in the provision of such a Navy and such an Army as these expenditure figures imply. Of the Civil Services estimate of 505.8 million pounds it might be observed, with interest at least, that 325.4 million pounds + 65 million pounds (or 389.4 million pounds) are a provision in part for vanishing obligations, and in part for permanent, the pensions being classed among the latter, and the bread subsidy among the

former. Mr. Chamberlain, indeed, made some tentative attempts at framing an estimate of expenditure and revenue after we have wholly left war's shadow, but neither he nor the House were much pleased, nor much helped by the essay. The result was inevitable owing to the fatal spirit which presides at the moment over policy.

There remains on the expenditure side to notice the appropriation proposed for the National Debt, which is down for £360,000,000, of which sum £330,000,000 are outside the fixed debt charge, or, principally are required to cover the debt created during the war. That being so, it will be useful to add some figures respecting the debt, for Mr. Chamberlain's figures were not so clear as was desirable. The debt on the 31st March, 1918, was returned as £5,921,000,000, and it has been shown that at 31st March, 1919, the deficit on 1918-19 was £1,690,000,000, making the total at the last date £7,611,000,000. Even without a sinking fund the interest on that sum at 5 per cent. would not be covered by the £360,000,000 appropriated; and so it is necessary to remember that some £600,000,000 are Consols at $2\frac{1}{2}$, and other portions of the Debt are held at a lower interest than five. But is that total given above, £7,611,000,000, the whole of the outstanding debt? Mr. Chamberlain was by no means clear about that. He gave the Debt at £7,435,000,000 in March last, to which should be added liabilities on War Bonds and on War Savings Certificates, amounting possibly to 116.7 million pounds more. Still, it is not clear whether two other accounts are included in the total of 7,551.7 million pounds. Are the obligations from Colonies and Allies within that sum?—they amount to £1,739,000,000. The Colonial Dominions owe £171,000,000; then allied countries owe: Russia (in millions), £568.1; France, £434.5; Italy, £412.5; Belgium, £86.7; Serbia, £18.7; and other Allies, £47.9. And India will contribute £30,000,000 more. Again secondly, are the "short paper," Treasury Bills, &c., of which some £1,753,000,000 of several denominations are current, included in the figure given for the total debt? If so, the appropriation for debt may be adequate; but the obligations of the country at the moment may be taken to exceed the figure, for reasons easily imagined. Anyway, it is a suggestive contrast, that between £645,000,000 at the outbreak of war and the acknowledged debt of £7,611,000,000 in March, 1919. Mr. Chamberlain spoke, as Mr. Bonar Law also last year, of the debt owing to us by Allies as assets; and doubtless they are so potentially; but the potency is not great, nor uniform, and provision has to be made by us meanwhile to carry the burden, nor can it be foreseen, in one or two cases, when repayment may be expected. So our indebtedness is at least twelve times what it was before the war. The Chancellor should be requested to clear up the doubt respecting the amount of the debt.

Mr. Chamberlain, who attempted the part once and again, was not a convincing preacher of economy. In face of the piled-up liabilities from the great war, the House of Commons did not blink at all, apparently, though it is known that the magnitude of the debt is regarded very seriously. Yet the Chancellor of the Exchequer was in the unfortunate position that his prelections could not carry conviction while his own department had failed during war, and other

spending departments were still more than suspected of laxity and unnecessary expenditure. He was also constrained to note how, in addition to a still vast expenditure and a colossal war debt, there is the Currency Note issue, which had notes outstanding on the 30th April amounting to £349,000,000, against which only £28,500,000 in gold is held at the Bank, or about $8\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. of the total now current. Very properly the Chancellor saw that the £310,000,000 of notes should be regarded as an addition to the National Debt. Lower down, in reviewing the Budget as a whole, something will be said of the Chancellor's attitude towards the Debt.

On referring to Table A, and the column for Revenue, we come to that which interests the individual chiefly at Budget time, viz., what changes are proposed in taxation. Such concentration of attention misses the prime matter in such a table, the expenditure—the cause of taxation. Before reviewing the fiscal changes for the year, it should once more be observed how the final form of the Budget statement leaves an anticipated deficit of 233.8 million pounds. Revenue amounting to £1,201,000,000 is foreseen, and yet such a large sum leaves a serious deficit to be added to the Debt. That should be kept in mind when studying the Budget. Neither the whole of expenditure incurred, nor an income to cover it all, are to be found here.

The estimated effect of the proposed changes is seen below:—

TABLE B.

				In 1919-20.		In a Full Year.
				£		£
<i>Customs—</i>						
Spirits	+ 3,850,000	...	+ 4,150,000
			...	+ 150,000*	...	+ 250,000*
Beer	+ 20,000	...	+ 20,000
Tea	- 1,800,000*	...	- 2,300,000*
Cocoa and Coffee	- 220,000*	...	- 350,000*
Sugar	- 500,000*	...	- 700,000*
Tobacco	- 90,000*	...	- 140,000*
Motor Spirit	- 60,000*	...	- 80,000*
<i>Excise—</i>						
Spirits	+ 16,000,000	...	+ 17,500,000
Beer	+ 22,180,000	...	+ 31,180,000
Tobacco	- 10,000*	...	- 10,000*
Motor Spirit	- 70,000	...	- 70,000
Motor Spirit Licence Duty	- 500,000	...	- 500,000
Total—Customs and Excise				£+38,950,000	...	£+48,950,000

The fiscal changes disclosed in this table as touching Customs, Excise, and Estate Duty may be seen more in detail as follows:—

Preference by LOWER duty, save on Spirits.

On Tea, Sugar, Coffee, Cocoa, and consumable articles (save alcohol),
 $\frac{1}{6}$ less of duty.

Tobacco—also $\frac{1}{6}$ less, or 1s. 4d. in the lb.

Motor Spirit— $\frac{1}{6}$ off duty, or about 1d. in the gallon.

Clocks, Watches, Films, Pianos, &c., Motor cars— $\frac{1}{3}$ off duty of 1915.

Wine—6d. on 1s. 3d. a gallon, 1s. on 3s. rate; and on *bottled*—6d. on 1s., and 9d. on 2s. 6d. rate.

Spirits—an increase of 2s. 6d. a gallon on *foreign Spirits*.

The change with regard to foreign spirits will take effect from 1st September, but on tea on the 2nd June.

In the Inland Revenue the increased Estate Duties will add now £2,500,000, and £10,000,000 in a full year. The reduction of 40 per cent. on Excess Profits Duty will bring about £50,000,000 in a full year, but not this year probably. It is thought that the above changes will add $4\frac{1}{2}$ million pounds this year, and 108.9 million pounds in a full year. The above table distinguishes between changes which bring a revenue and those which do not. The revenue getters are spirits and beer, both home and foreign sorts. The peculiar mark of Mr. Chamberlain's Budget is that though he needed revenue badly, so many of his changes in taxation involved a loss of revenue. Those to which an asterisk is attached are losses in consequence of the proposed preference to goods hailing from British possessions. The existing duty on motor spirit, and the associated licence duty are remitted, and hence that loss. Spirit duty is raised from 30s. to 50s. a gallon, and beer duty from 50s. to 70s. a barrel at 1055 deg. gravity; and 75 per cent. of increased barrelage will be allowed to brewers as compared with 1918.

The alterations in Inland Revenue are important, as the Estate Duty will now be graduated more severely on sums exceeding £15,000 passing at death, so that the rates of charge will ascend from 1 per cent. up to £500, to 40 per cent. on estates exceeding £2,000,000. Thus Excess Profits Duty from the 1st of January, 1919, will be due at 40 per cent., instead of 80 per cent. of these profits, and a corresponding reduction will be made in the excess Minerals Rights Duty charged.

The effect on the revenue of all these changes, for this year, appears in Table A, from which it is seen that of the £940,000,000 expected from tax revenue, some $25\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. will be drawn from indirect sources, chiefly beer and spirits. Special attention should be drawn to the great sum—£354,000,000—expected from Income Tax, which remains unchanged, and that £300,000,000 are expected from Excess Profits Duty—revenue due already on past accounts. It is remarkable, too, that taking the Postal Service together they are not expected to be quite self-sustaining; but that may prove a miscalculation. The Miscellaneous Revenue is put down at 209.7 million pounds, a huge sum to be fed from gifts and appropriations from materials in hand, the latter a question which should be overhauled this year by the House of Commons.

Looked upon as a whole the Budget points to a halting Government. Nothing is done with a firm hand, and it will be surprising if the Budget can give courage to others. The need for this great revenue granted, many will not object to the "screwing up" of the Spirit and Beer duties. The treatment of the Excess Profits Duty is very questionable, especially as this year is treated as in the war

zone. Again, should Excess Profits Duty belonging to past accounts be used for this year's revenue instead of being placed to the National Debt? Objections to Excess Profits Duty are now what used to be said against Income Tax. Every such charge is disagreeable; but when revenue is demanded, should the duty not have been kept as it was while war charges are incurred, or rather should it not be made more general? The most impressive fact is that, though the duty was imposed, and is said to be discouraging, certain businesses have made such thumping profits!

Mr. Chamberlain's hesitant and filial preference duties are to result in a loss of revenue to the tune of $3\frac{1}{2}$ million pounds ultimately; but he hopes they are only a beginning. Of what—a loss of revenue or the development of trade? Here we have his filial piety leading him, who seeks revenue, to impose duties so that he shall lose revenue; he is using taxation, not for revenue, but for some other purposes. Let the reader follow out the working of a preference on tea, or tobacco, or pianos or motor-cars, and some absurd results will be disclosed. But absurdity in this case leads to danger also; for the strong bond with the Dominions, proved on the great battlefields, may be broken by irritating disputes about Customs duties, and still more, our Allies in war, China, France, Italy, America, and other countries, from the first moment after war, will find themselves discouraged from trading with us; and the Dominions, especially at this first step into protection, may say "Thank you for nothing," as any monetary advantage of the proposed arrangements will go chiefly to British growers and dealers in goods on which "preference" is granted. Mr. Chamberlain has failed to meet the demands of an important occasion. His filial piety may be sincere and strong, yet we may fancy him repeating as he went to the House on the 30th April:—

"The times are out of joint. O! cursed spite
That ever I was born to set them right,"

for over the whole Budget is the hesitation to deal with a big situation. Is it National Debt?—he has no policy. Is it a question of the Excess Profits Duty?—he seizes revenue of a past year to meet the needs of this, and leaves the question of after-war revenue to the future; he would erect a pious economic reminder of his father, but declares at the same time that he is not deciding the commercial policy of this kingdom. Of course, he decides nothing, but leaves all to drift, and commerce without confidence, but does enough by his peddling "preferences" to hinder the revival of our trade, and to set much and many on edge . . . *c'est le premier pas qui coûte*; but judging from the discussions in the Commons, Mr. Chamberlain is in earnest on no part of his Budget, save his preference items at once so ineffective, so dangerous, so unjust.

W. M. J. WILLIAMS.

ART IN FRANCE DURING THE WAR.

THE stupendous and stupefying contest between Ahriman and Ormuzd, between civilisation and *kultur*, which contest has shaken the Old World as no other war has done before, either in regard to extent or depth, and produced changes of which the boldest innovators did not dare to dream, has also influenced our art. At the beginning of the world-embracing calamity there was a measure of despondency and even of inactivity amongst our artists, for, as one of them said, "Le temps n'est pas propice au travail; la pensée est ailleurs; il y a trop de douleurs autour de nous."* However, the lofty genius of France has soon become conscious that a passive attitude is a grievous mistake, and that an artist who creates his masterpieces labours before all for his country, his works constituting its imperishable glory, and in the meanwhile assuring him of immortality. The French artists then recollected—some of them being prompted by their intuition if not by their knowledge of history—that it was during the Peloponnesian—an abominable and fratricidal war fought two thousand years ago during twenty-seven years—that Sophocles created every two years an immortal trilogy, and that Aristophanes wrote his biting comedies. From that barbarous struggle for economic and political hegemony there remains to-day but a tangle of dates which confuse students, whilst the radiant masterpieces are surrounded for ever with a halo of eternal glory. In the patrimony of a nation how many and which victories have the same importance as have its masterpieces? What is the Battle of Crécy worth when compared with Paradise Lost or Waterloo with the Reims Cathedral? Of what value is the whole commercial activity of Venice in relation to the importance of the canvases of Titian, of Giorgione, of Veronese? There remains but a faint remembrance of trafficking Phœnicia, whilst artistic Greece is borne in mind with reverence by the whole of cultivated mankind. Sallust was right when he said that the honour of recording deeds is as great as that of performing them.

The activity of the French in the demesnes of art was almost entirely suspended during the first months of the war, but as they have never forgotten—even during the darkest days of their superhuman ordeal—that art is the highest human function, a faculty proper to man alone amongst all created beings, of which faculty he ought to be proud on account of being capable of feeling in him that incoercible force and that imprescriptible exercise, they soon manifested that faculty by re-starting the publication of the *Gazette des Beaux Arts*, suspended in 1914; by lectures on art in l'Ecole du Louvre and the Sorbonne; by the re-opening of the Musée du Luxembourg, and by organising various art exhibitions, of which activity the most important was the participation of France in the international show at San Francisco, where the French artists exhibited 229 works of art. Then in 1915 there was the "Salon des Poilus"—an interesting and touching

* Massenet.

mixture; "l'Exposition de la Guerre" in May of the same year; "La Triennale," which in March, 1916, gathered works of many already known artists;* several shows at the George Petit gallery; then the Galerie Druet had an "Exposition du premier groupe";† three selections of "Indépendants": one at Druet, one at Berheim-Jeune, and one at Goupil. A group of young artists called "Le vingt et un" have shown at the Galerie Manuel some interesting works of Paul Denno, of Mlle. Séailles, of Gustave Hervé, of Jean Rubzak, of Lejeune, of Cheminade, of Mlle. Mireille Masson, and of Mineur. "La Ligue Navale" has organised a good exhibition of the painters of the sea, whilst the "Exposition de Douze" was remarkable especially in the works of Raffaelli and Le Sidaner. Then several artists, such as Albert Lebourg, Paul Renouard, George Belnet, Guillaumain, Charles Pacait, Le Doux, and Comoin, held their own shows in various galleries. Finally, after three years of intermission, "La Société Nationale" and "Les Artistes Français" have exhibited under one cupola of the Petit Palais instead of at the Grand Palais as well. This was the result of the war, which has united not only all political parties in France, but also has reconciled the two antagonistic groups of artists, who agreed on suspension of enmity, if not on durability of peace. There was nothing very remarkable about the works exhibited in the Salon;‡ they constituted a good and agreeable average, showing knowledge and cleverness; there were some *belles peintures*, but very few *grandes toiles*. There were many pictures by dead artists, such as Carolus Duran, Gustave Ricard, Puvis de Chavanne, Manet, Gaston Latouche, and Degas, the latter amazing by the exorbitant prices paid for his canvases, and not the best at that.

A curious and original performance prompted by the war is "Le Crapouillot." It is a journal of the trenches edited by a group of gifted men, full of *verve*, who have witnessed tragical spectacles and know how to note painful but picturesque details with astounding acuteness, as shown in Taquoy's puissant sketches, in Suzac's beautiful drawings, in Warnod's etchings of great merit, in Luc-Albert Moreau's vigorous art, in Charmaison's strong and precise visions, and in Desiré Martin's and Jean Loup Forain's work *plein d'esprit*. Only French artistic genius is capable of producing something truly æsthetic from this abominable and disgusting war.

Art is, for those who know how to listen to it, a language more

* Rodin, Degas, Laurent, Renoir, Lebourg, Menard, Odilon Redon, Harpignies, Bonnait, Quost, Besnard, Colin, Jeaniot, Louis Legrand, Henri Matisse, Marquet, Lebasque, Carrera, Flanarin, Henri Martin, Auguste Lepère, Maurice Denis, Maxime Maufra, Charles Guérin, Pierre Leprade, and many others.

† George, d'Espagnat, Maurice Denis, Louis Valtat, Pierre Leprade, Paul Serurier, Herman Paul, Vallaton, and Joseph Bernard.

‡ "Jeune Fille en bonnet rouge" by Roll did not look like Bellona. Flameny's pictures of the war were curious but lacking in expression. Scott paints uniforms, Davambez Indian soldiers; Forain's work is violent and tragical. Laurens, Adrien Milhouard, Henri Bataille, Maurice Chabas, Lanthe, William Malherbe, François Guiget, and Michel Cazin gave portraits—there was a profusion of portraits of generals. Landscape was represented by Le Sidaner, Auguste Matisse, Nozal, Touchet, Lucien Griveau, Mme. Desbordes, Auguste Lepère, and Louis Legrand.

lucid than are words; it is a language of profound sentiments and of lively affections, a language to which the world listens, but which does not speak. It is used only by those who have to express certain emotions of life, a certain special love for the beautiful. It is easier to make speak in words what one wishes to say; it is more difficult to make live a work of art. A nation does not choose its language; it makes art to its image; it shapes it according to its taste. Art is the most sincere and the most truthful utterance; it is the only pyx in which a nation deposits its rich treasures and its deep secrets. Germany, under a pretext of science, has invented a gross conception, according to which everything is dominated by material facts and physical reality; history is substituted by anthropology; it becomes a chapter of natural history, as Renan indignantly said. According to this system the struggles of nations have no other character than the fights of species: of gorilla, chimpanzee, and orangoutang. A hideous point of view! What would then become of the world if such philosophy became prevalent? No! history is not, as the Germans uphold, the history of fatality. The whole history of mankind is the record of efforts to escape fatality. No matter what are the forces that bind and oppress us, there are others which lift us and free us; art as well as *la patrie* are creations of love and freedom. Therefore, as the spiritual arms are also means of combat, let us use them against the barbarians; let all human factors—literature and art amongst them—help us! . . .

Since the thirteenth century the influence of French art has been felt throughout the world—one could even rightly affirm that it rules over the world, through the medium of Gothic churches and Gothic buildings, for the so-called Gothic style originated in France. The Germans are conscious of this supremacy, and that is why—this is a logical surmise—they have annihilated such unequalled embodiments of French art as the buildings at Louvain, at Arras, at Ypres, at Reims, and at many other places. However, notwithstanding their asinine savagery, the sublime tradition of French art represented at the beginning of its history by André Beauneveu—a universal artist, painter, architect, sculptor; by Jean d'Orleans, Colart de Laon, Etienne Lamelier; by three Moluels: Jean, Paul, and Henri, who produced "*Très Riches Heures de Chantilly*," a most illustrious book of beauty and of poetry which has never been surpassed; by Henri Bellechose, Jean Bourdichon, Jean Clouet, Corneille de Lyon, and especially by Charanton, his "*Couronnement de la Vierge*," painted in 1453, being a masterpiece, a poem, a world; by Nicolas Froment, whose "*Buisson ardent*" is the most monumental picture of the old school; and by Jean Fouquet, whose portrait of Pope Eugène IV. inspired Raphael for his presentment of Leon X. In the works of those artists is manifested our genius, that never forgets the tradition of measure and of good sense, that is easily understood and is continued in the works of our contemporary artists, notwithstanding the most adverse circumstances—many artists being obliged to become *camoufleurs**—for the

* Bernard Naudin, George Bruyer, George Leroux, de Broca, Mathurin Méheut, Louis Montagné.

blossoming of the most precious and the most sensitive of plants—that of art.

Beauty is not one; art modifies itself continually; Rembrandt and Rubens have their places as well as have Raphael and Leonardo da Vinci; there is no infallible prescription for the creation of masterpieces; there is no climate which is more favourable than others for the production of genius. Those verities are clearly revealed in French art during the war, and although there is no startling difference in painting before the catastrophe, either *in facture* or in inspiration; although there is not an intimate and immediate connection between the most formidable shocks of the continent and the most subtle seismograph registering the smallest shudderings of the soul; nevertheless, the changes in regard to background, to action and to subject are so remarkable that they are bound to influence artistic activity.

In the first place, the subject—man—represented in actual French art of the war is different from the man painted by Van der Meulen,* Vernet, Gros, Gérard, Géricault, Blarenberghe,† and even those who are near us, such as de Neuville and Détaillé. Although individual heroic deeds are to-day as brilliant as they were formerly, those who perform them do not assume the heroic attitudes of d'Artagnan, they do not mount enormous chargers as Géricault's "Dragoon," they do not show their valour in poses full of defiance, nay, of arrogance, as the world-renowned equestrian statue in Venice personifying the pugnacious spirit of the fifteenth century in Verocchio's (1422-1488) Colleone, popularly called Condotiere. Modern soldiers are quite different: they are dressed differently—they no longer wear uniforms of lively blue and red that make a bright spot on the background of the battlefield; they are simple, silent philosophers in their manner, and conscious of their strength; they are patient, tenacious and self-sacrificing in the defence of the soil, which they love above all; we are familiar with those French peasants through the pictures of Bastien Lepage, of Lhermite, of Jules Breton, of Lucien Simon. Consequently such contemporary painters as Henry de Groux, Mlle. Breslau and Luce paint quite different pictures from those executed during and after the war of 1870. Luce is a realist: he depicts under the uniform the gait of peasants or workmen—the movements that are the result of their every-day occupation; he tries to seize the exterior shape of the body, an aspect of mobility full of details, which make his studies of grey-blue mingled with khaki very interesting; his soldiers are picturesque. Luce is not a sumptuous delineator of battles depicting the glory of kings; neither is he one of the modern nervous artists who dramatise episodes of cerebral contests; he follows the tradition of Watteau, of Géricault, of Lançon, for whom a soldier was, at certain moments, a subject of study. Mlle. Breslau gives us pictures representing the Red Cross nurses and displays all the qualities

* He was the historiographer of campaigns and sieges of Louis XIV. and left us many gay and poignant images, many luminous, alert and iridescent pages.

† He painted the white and blue squadrons of Marechal de Saxe dislodging the enormous red columns of the Duke of Cumberland.

so much admired in Fantin Latour, to which there is a more lively feast of colouring and a more apparent influx of life. As to Henry de Groux, he is one of the most fugacious romantics of the actual art of painting; he is perhaps the only painter who tries to represent compositions that have their own beauty; instead of painting fragments of nature or of life, as the majority of modern artists do, thinking that through the disdain for composition, so much cherished by the old painters, they contribute to the progress of art; instead of humanitarian aspects, as did Degas, Groux gives us lyrical and dramatic *entente* of subjects as did Delacroix.

The action is also changed: it is no longer as precise as it was at Fontenoy or Waterloo. Grand Condé's and Turenne's æsthetics have disappeared; to-day one does not see the development of a whole battle, for it is so gigantic that one cannot embrace it; and then, what is most essential for an artist, there is no element of picturesqueness; there is no supreme chief, the conscious centre of a great fighting organism, as was Henry IV. on the battlefield of Contras rallying his soldiers round his *panache blanc*; no Bonaparte leading his army across the bridge of Arcola and holding *le drapeau tricolor*, or seated on his white charger and surveying a battle from a hill as represented by Meissonier; no picturesque Murat, clad in a gorgeous uniform and brandishing his flashing sword at the head of his whirlwind-like cavalry. Never before have the appearances revealed less realities than they do now, for in the present war everything is hidden, *camouflaged*: lorries, cars, cannon, tanks, are all painted in variegated colours according to the ambient landscape or surrounding soil. It is a hard problem to make something artistic from such elements! Consequently, all that the modern artists could do was to create heroical silhouettes as does Le Blant, or large decorative canvases of ample majesty of line, as did Maurice Chabot; or paint tragical conjurations of "Morts pour la patrie" as did Le Sidaner; or execute penetrating pictures made under the impression of the murdering of peasants: men, women, and children maddened through fear as did Jeaniot.

Finally, the background is different. Formerly brave military deeds, as Wooverman's cavalry encounters, were painted amidst laughing landscapes, rich in trees and shrubs. To-day *le terrain* is a desert full of sad ruins and heartbreaking desolation: everything is destroyed, annihilated, pulverised. Instead of a beautiful panorama, artists are obliged to depict ruins and find elements of the beautiful in that which apparently has none. This, however, has been done with excellent results by such gifted painters as Duvent, Méheut, Flameng, Vignal, and Arr, whose admirable although sinister portraits of ruins will remain for ever as an opprobrious reproach of shame. Senechall's pictures representing the burning of Rheims and Flameng's "Arras" will reveal to posterity that German books and lectures on art could not mean anything else but a profound indifference to and even secret hatred for the beautiful, for it is beyond human comprehension how it is possible that those who pretend to love beauty

could commit such unpardonable sins against it. Yes, the Germans have destituted France and Flanders of their most glorious works of art — either by destroying or carrying them away; but all their barbarous savagery will not lessen the artistic supremacy of those countries over theirs, and will not make Claus Sluter, who sculptured the astounding “Well of Moses” for the Cloister of the Chartreuse at Dijon, a German, notwithstanding their cunning and would-be learned arguments, no more than their reasoning can convince the world that the art of Jean van Eyck was German—for they cannot change the fact that already Facio* called him Johannes Gallicus and not Germanicus — who by the medium of his immortal work “Polyptique de l’Agneau mystique” dominates the history of pictorial art more than a hundred years ahead, for it is a *summa aris*. Then the names of the Count von Manteuffel, who commanded the destruction of Louvain, with its priceless masterpieces, and of General von Klüg, who ordered the bombardment of Rheims Cathedral, will be for ever coupled with the infamous Zoroaster, who burned the marvellous temple of Diana of Ephesus, but, with this difference in favour of the tar-smelling cobbler, that he desired to become immortal through his asinine deed, whilst it is impossible to find a shadow of excuse—even by the most sophisticated mind—for the would-be German noblemen, who henceforth will remain branded with infamy and represent the embodiment of foul savagery.

If the reader recollects what France has done during the war in the domain of literature,† and links it with the above-mentioned facts, arguments, and thoughts, then he will be easily convinced that in *la belle France* the collectivity is sound, strong, honourable, and even sublime, notwithstanding that here and there appear ignoble individuals, low propensities, sordid lucre and repulsive tares; that *la patrie* is a reality; that now more than ever France is a refuge and a champion of all liberties of the world, and that the game for the freedom of mankind was played on the banks of the Marne, of the Meuse, in Argonne, as well as in Flanders; and then, that all which is not a thought is nothingness, and that barbarism will never prevail over beauty, for it is beauty that effaces its vestiges, annuls its stigma, obliterates its opprobrium, and even its reminiscence; and, finally, that France continues her glorious traditions, and is true not only to her military, but also to her literary and artistic ideals. Therefore, France is worthy of her noble Allies, the English, and their enthusiastic admiration, which is expressed so often and so feelingly in their Press, that every Frenchman’s heart should be filled not only with delight at their praises, but also with gratitude for the constancy of their friendliness, which, let us hope, will last for aye and aye.

SOISSONS.

* B. F. et J. J. Pontani rerum suo tempore gestarum libri sexdecim—Basileac, 1566-67.

† “The Intellectual Activity of France During the War,” THE CONTEMPORARY REVIEW, May, 1918.

THE RELIGION OF ROBINSON CRUSOE.

THE day after he was wrecked on the island, Robinson Crusoe swam off to the ship; but his difficulty was to get on board, for the vessel lay high out of the water. "There was nothing within my reach to lay hold of. I swam round her twice, and the second time I spy'd a small piece of rope, which I wonder'd I did not see at first, hang down by the fore-chains." And so he managed to clamber on board. When we read *Robinson Crusoe* over again, we have the same experience. We go back to it in middle life, and we are surprised to find something there that we had not noticed before—a thread, and more than a thread, of what may be called "preaching." Perhaps it was always there, though editions for boys leave out some of the moralising comments. But they are too closely woven into the stuff of the story to be cut out entirely, and our young eyes must have passed over them without appreciating their significance. We were not all like Ruskin, who was allowed to read *Robinson Crusoe* on Sunday, evidently on the ground that it "preached" as directly as the *Pilgrim's Progress*. Most of us were caught by the book on some week-day, like Lavengro, though we could not have described our emotions as he did; it was the fascination of the story that gripped our imagination, especially if we had Lavengro's joy of reading it in a volume with good, coloured illustrations. Now we go back to it. Exactly two hundred years have passed since it was published, on April 25th, 1719. We take down that first part again, in the years when we like soup better than pudding and have a real taste for Wordsworth—two sure signs of middle-age; and we wonder we never saw before the obvious amount of preaching or moralising in the romance.

There is no wonder in it, if we recollect who Defoe was. Like Coleridge, he was brought up to be a dissenting minister, and if he had asked his friends, as Coleridge is said once to have asked Lamb, whether they had ever heard him preach, the reply might have been the same, "I never heard you do anything else." That is, in his novels. Defoe never got so far as Coleridge in the way of preaching, but he does not disguise the moral purpose in his romances, and this holds true pre-eminently of *Robinson Crusoe*. He did not qualify himself for delivering sermons in a Presbyterian pulpit, but the first part of this story has sentences and even paragraphs that would not have been out of place there. The love of it grew on him, for next year he issued *Serious Reflections*, appropriate, as he thought, to a man in Robinson Crusoe's plight. These we may leave aside. So far as the first part of the book is concerned, the moralising passages are not only vital but organic; they are put in because the writer meant them sincerely, and they have the merit of lucidity. Bishop Warburton, in one of his notes to Clarendon's *History*, sneeringly observes that "the tendency of a Presbyterian composition is to be tedious and fulsome: the one the mark of a cloudy understanding; the other of a base heart." Warburton, rebuking tediousness, is a sight for the humourist.

But, apart from that, his comment would not have applied to the religious sections in *Robinson Crusoe*. Defoe had no occasion to be fulsome, and no temper of tediousness or cloudiness. He wrote it on the principle that a good writer "writes so as to please and serve at the same time," and with the sense that his audience demanded more in a story than a mere story. The moralising spirit was abroad in England, and Defoe then, as always, was not only ready to give his public what they wanted, but to give them what he himself believed. He would serve them by infusing moral and religious precepts into his romance, just as he did, three years later, in his *Journal of the Plague Year*. "Here," as Mr. G. A. Aitken points out, "it was not a single man, but a great city, which was visited with dire calamity; but the problem was similar. How would these men come out of the ordeal? How would they behave towards each other and towards God?" Crusoe came well out of the ordeal, with courage, pluck, endurance, and interest in his fellows. And Defoe makes you see that he owed these qualities largely to his religion.

Now Robinson Crusoe's religion is well marked. It is Defoe's, of course, but we had better not dull the impression by dallying with the notion that the tale is an allegory. This extraordinary idea would be the ruin of the book, either as fiction or as a work of religious interest, and we have Professor Saintsbury's authority for holding that it has no serious foundation. Take Robinson Crusoe on his island, unspoiled by allegory, and we find he has definite religious convictions. Defoe hated heartily three things—Jacobites, the devil, and Papists. There were no Jacobites on the island, but the devil was there as palpably as he was to Wesley in England. Or, at least, he might be. For our hero reasoned himself out of the fear that the print of the naked foot on the sand was the devil's. Huxley remarked that "Robinson Crusoe did not feel bound to conclude from the single human footprint which he saw in the sand, that the maker of the impression had only one leg." He did not; but, as he ran home in terror, one of his first thoughts was that it might be the devil. However, he reflected that Satan was too acute to try to frighten him by such a trick. Why should the devil take human shape "in such a place where there could be no manner of occasion for it, but to leave the print of his foot behind him, and that even for no purpose too, for he could not be sure I should see it?" Besides, Satan would not have put the mark where any wave might obliterate it. No; this was inconsistent "with all the notions we usually entertain of the subtlety of the devil." But he carefully taught Friday about the devil. Indeed, he confesses, "I found it was not so easy to imprint right notions in his mind about the devil as it was about the being of a God"; for, when Crusoe informed the savage that God was stronger than the devil, the awkward question came, "Why God no kill the devil, so make him no more do mischief?" This was a poser. Crusoe pretended at first that he did not hear the inconvenient question, and, when he replied that the devil would be punished at the end of the world, Friday remarked, "Why not kill the devil now, not kill great ago?" Crusoe countered with, God no more

kills the devil at once than He kills us; He spares us to repent. But this only landed him in a worse plight, for Friday instantly suggested what Burns afterwards conceived, the possibility of the devil himself being pardoned. " 'Well, well,' says he, mighty affectionately, 'that well; so you, I, devil, all wicked, all preserve, repent, God pardon all.' " Whereupon Crusoe hurriedly went out for a walk. He was more ready to encounter the devil than to argue about him. "No Popish saint," says Henry Kingsley, "not even St. Anthony himself, believed more fully in the devil, or was more ready for a battle royal with him, with a certainty of victory, than was the ultra-Protestant Defoe."

Crusoe's Protestantism has less chance, under the circumstances. But he improves the occasion, when Friday tells him about the priests who went up the mountain to get oracles from the deity Benamuckee for the benighted cannibals down below. "I observ'd that there is priestcraft even among the most blinded pagans in the world: and the policy of making a secret religion, in order to preserve the veneration of the people to the clergy, is not only to be found in the Romans but perhaps among all religions in the world, even among the most brutish and barbarous savages." He hesitates to trust himself to the Spanish refugees on the adjacent island. Might they not hand him over to the priests when they get home? "I had rather be deliver'd up to the savages and be devour'd alive than fall into the merciless claws of the priests, and be carried into the Inquisition." In the second part, Crusoe gives a generous account of the heroic young priest whom he rescued from drowning. But in the first part the few allusions to Popery are invariably antagonistic, as antagonistic as we might expect from a man who had fought for Monmouth.

Crusoe also believed in the Bible as the religion of Protestants. Among the spoils which he rescued from the ship were three "very good Bibles," and although he did not read the Bible for a while, he came to find his strength and comfort in its pages. This was the positive, definite basis of his religion. He begins with the New Testament. "I impos'd upon myself to read awhile every morning and every night, not tying myself to the number of chapters, but as long as my thoughts should engage me." But he did not confine himself to the New Testament. And he found, like Bunyan, that a text could find him. For example, when he was still worried about the origin of the footprint on the sand, which he now feared was due to savages, he woke one morning discomposed with the thought of his danger. "Upon which those words of the Scripture came into my thoughts: *Call upon Me in the day of trouble, I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorify Me.* Upon this, rising cheerfully out of bed, my heart was not only comforted, but I was guided and encouraged to pray earnestly to God for deliverance. When I had done praying, I took up my Bible and, opening it to read, the first words that presented to me were: *Wait on the Lord, and be of good cheer, and He shall strengthen thy heart: wait, I say, on the Lord.* It is impossible to express the comfort this gave me. In answer, I thankfully laid down the book and was no more sad; at least, not on that occasion." The last six words are extra-

ordinarily true to human nature, as well as a note of Defoe's minute accuracy.

But the outstanding feature of his religion is a belief in Providence. This is often fostered by the sudden recollection of some Bible phrase applicable to his present situation, but it is deeply rooted in his nature. No word occurs more often in *Robinson Crusoe* than "Providence." Newman once wrote three sentences to connect this belief, so common among English people, with their love of the Bible. "What Scripture especially illustrates from its first page to its last is God's Providence; and that is nearly the only doctrine held with a real assent by the mass of religious Englishmen. Hence the Bible is so great a solace and refuge to them in trouble. I repeat, I am not speaking of particular schools and parties in England, whether of the High Church or the Low, but of the mass of piously-minded and well-living people in all ranks of the community." Now Robinson Crusoe had not been well-living. He had run away from home and disobeyed his parents. But, on reflection, he sees Providence sending him retribution for that in his wreck and solitude. He acknowledges the justice of it all. And from that he manages usually to rise to a position of contentment. He struggles with doubts and bitterness till he wins what is often miscalled resignation. He might be worse off than he is. That is one source of peace. And his state has compensations. He solemnly sets down the good and the bad sides of his lot, and honestly finds that the discomforts are outweighed by the advantages. "Let this stand as a direction from the experience of the most miserable conditions in this world, that we may always find in it something to comfort ourselves from, and to set in the description of good and evil, on the credit side of the account." He can even rise eventually to thank God for his circumstances. And he realises the profound religious truth that thankfulness is not merely an extra but an essential note of moral strength. "I learned to look more on the bright side of my condition and less upon the dark side, and to consider what I enjoyed rather than what I wanted; and this gave me sometimes such secret comforts that I cannot express them. . . . All our discontents about what we want appeared to me to spring from the want of thankfulness for what we have." This is good doctrine for an island or a continent. Crusoe discovers that he is a happier as well as a better man upon the island than he had been before when he was at liberty. He has learned the real values of life, and the lesson is worth what he has to pay for it.

Providence made him pay the price. But his simple philosophy of Providence goes deeper than the mere thought of retribution; it amounts to belief in a special Providence; and this is no smug self-satisfaction, for Crusoe frankly admits he did not deserve to be directed by Heaven, and he admits also that he began with no more than a vague sense of chance in things. It was only the successive aids and escapes in his adventurous career that forced him to rise to the faith in a special Providence. He told the captain who was the means of his rescue that "the whole transaction seemed to be a chain of wonders; that such things as these were the testimonies we had of a secret hand of Providence governing the world, and an

evidence that the eyes of an infinite Power could search into the remotest corner of the world and send help to the miserable whenever he pleased." This is the manly, humble, and simple core of his faith in Providence. It is thrown into relief by his own waywardness and infatuation. When he looks back upon his life, he is tempted sometimes to believe that he was fated to go wrong, that an evil influence made him deaf to his father's remonstrances. But he concludes that he must not say "It is a secret over-ruling decree that hurries us on to be the instruments of our own destruction, even though it be before us." If he shut his ears to calm reason it was his own fault; "I was born to be my own destroyer." And yet Providence, as it were, stepped in and took charge of him. When the barley grows up unexpectedly near his cave, he is awakened for a while to the kindly Providence, "so strange and unforeseen," which spared these grains from the ship and led him to throw them unwittingly in the very place where they could get shade to grow. Before that, as he says, "I had very few notions of religion in my head, or had entertained any sense of anything that had befallen me, otherwise than as a chance, or, as we lightly say, what pleases God, without so much as enquiring into the end of the Providence in these things, or His order in governing events in the world." So he works out his faith in Providence from the realities of experience by reflection. Not a bad way of fashioning religious faith. For if no scripture is of private interpretation, Providence is—for the thoughtful man.

He is also alive to the sudden, mysterious warnings and intuitions of life, which fall under Providence. When the ship puts in, he feels doubtful about revealing his presence, in case the crew were thieves and murderers. They were. And Crusoe reflects, "Let no man despise the secret hints and notices of danger which sometimes are given him, when he may think there is no possibility of its being real." This may become superstitious, of course, but it is sound advice, even though we may hesitate, as indeed Crusoe did, to refer these warnings to invisible, friendly spirits. "I cannot but advise all considering men whose lives are attended with such extraordinary incidents as mine, or even though not so extraordinary, not to slight such secret intimations of Providence; let them come from what invisible intelligence they will, that I shall not discuss, and perhaps cannot account for." These intimations are positive as well as negative. They come to Crusoe as strong impressions, sometimes impulses, to do something—in fact, so irresistible that they acquire the authority of Providence itself. A large part of his religion lies in being sensitive and obedient to these mysterious intimations. They start upon his mind sometimes from a text of the Bible that he reads or remembers, but more often directly, without the slightest outward occasion. His life is open to vibrations from the invisible world of Providence which surrounds him at every turn.

So, if Newman is right, Crusoe was, like Defoe himself, a true-born Englishman in his religion. Henry Kingsley said that the story of Crusoe was "the story of a thoroughly good man, fighting with nature, and debating with God." But Crusoe really has no

great struggle with nature on the island, and, although he once or twice ventures to arraign the justice of Providence, it is not because he feels himself harshly treated, like Job, but because he cannot see why the light of God's truth should be confined to a few, while so many millions like poor Friday are benighted. It is a passing mood which he soon shuts up. His personal faith is in Providence, large and special. Stevenson caught the same note in describing Ben Gunn, the castaway. "It were Providence that put me here," he tells Jim. "I've thought it all out in this here lonely island, and I'm back on piety." That is the religion of Robinson Crusoe; he is back on piety, and his piety rests on a hardly-won belief in some Providence over him.

JAMES MOFFATT.

THE CENTENARY OF CHARLES KINGSLEY.

(BORN JUNE 12, 1819.)

THERE are fashions in novels and novelists, and the household word of one generation is often no more than a name to another. The later Victorian novelists, Margaret Oliphant, Walter Besant, James Rice, William Black, and James Payn, who at one time had a wide circulation, as circulation went in those days, find to-day few readers. Of all their books only *Salem Chapel* and perhaps *Miss Marjoribanks* are known to more than a tithe of the general reading public of the twentieth century. The books of the great writers of the mid-Victorian period are, of course, with us still. Dickens, Thackeray, the Brontës, and George Eliot have a wide circle of admirers, though there is an increasing tendency to take their merits for granted, and to put their works on the shelf with those of Richardson, Fielding, Smollett, and Sterne, and to leave the perusal of them to the students of literature. A less kind fate has befallen the minor writers of that same period. Few read Whyte-Melville; fewer still William Carleton; and probably no one looks at anything written by Henry Kingsley—save *Ravenshoe*—though Henry Kingsley, a delightful human creature, will probably come again into his own. Lytton is regarded as old-fashioned, and treated accordingly; Disraeli is left to those interested in the politics and the social life of the times in which he wrote; Wilkie Collins is no longer in favour; Charles Reade survives only by *The Cloister and the Hearth*; and Anthony Trollope is remembered rather than read as the author of the *Barchester Novels*. Charles Kingsley was regarded in his day as a Trojan among novelists, but the glory has departed from him.

The biography of Kingsley is as little interesting as that of most men of letters. The son of a clergyman, he was born on June 12th, 1819, at Holme Vicarage, Devonshire. At the age of twelve he went to a school at Clifton, and in the following year to the Grammar School at Helston, Cornwall, the headmaster of which was then the Rev. Derwent Coleridge, second son of the poet. In 1836, Kingsley and his family removed to London, and he became a student at King's College. Two years later he entered Magdalene College, Cambridge. At the university his reading was rather desultory, but he managed to secure the last place in the first class of the classical tripos of 1842. Although earlier he had experienced religious doubts, he overcame them, and took holy orders. In July, 1842, he was ordained by the Bishop of Winchester to the curacy of Eversley, Hampshire. Early in 1844 he married Fanny, daughter of Pascoe Grenfell, with whom he had fallen in love whilst at Cambridge; and in the same year, the living of Eversley falling vacant, he was presented to it by Sir John Cope, the patron.

One of the greatest influences upon Kingsley in his youth was Frederick Denison Maurice. He read Maurice's writings while at Cambridge, and in 1844 became personally known to him. When in 1848 Kingsley published his drama on the subject of St.

Elizabeth of Hungary, which he called *The Saint's Tragedy*, Maurice wrote for it a preface. Through Maurice, Kingsley became acquainted with A. P. Stanley, Froude, J. M. Ludlow, and Thomas Hughes, and was intimately associated with the Christian Socialist Movement. It was his connection with this movement that made him turn his attention seriously to authorship. With all of a poet's enthusiasm, he took up the cudgels on behalf of the poor, and plied his pen vigorously in the hope of improving their condition. Over the signature of "Parson Lot" he contributed to *Politics for the People* in 1848; two years later, employing the same pseudonym, he published a pamphlet, *Cheap Clothes and Nasty*, which was presently reprinted with *Alton Locke*; and about that time wrote a good deal for the *Christian Socialist*. Stirred by the feelings which inspired those writings, he composed two novels, *Yeast*, which was serialised in *Fraser's Magazine* during the autumn of 1848, and was published in book-form in 1851; and *Alton Locke, Poet and Tailor*, which was published in 1850 by Chapman & Hall on the recommendation of Carlyle, who, however, later described it as a "fervid creation left half chaotic."

These novels were written with the best intentions, but from the point of literature they suffer from being propagandist works. *Yeast*, which is served up in the form of a novel, is really a pamphlet masquerading as a novel. The subject-matter, which takes the place of a plot, is the condition of the poor in this country at the time at which the book was written, and, by exposing this, is a plea for the amelioration of their lot. As is only to be expected, the characters are lay-figures, which are used as vehicles upon which to hang the expressions of views. Not one has any vitality: the labourers are no more alive than the landlords. The love-story is obviously dragged in because it was a tradition in those days that any work cast in the mould of fiction must have a love-interest. Launcelot is a tedious prig, who talks torrentially, and of Argemore it can only be said that she has views on religion. "Ouida" would certainly have made a better job of that spoiled darling of the Guards, Colonel Bracebridge. The one character that remains in the memory is an old gamekeeper, Harry Verrey.

What *Yeast* does for the labourer, *Alton Locke* does for the London artisan. The hero is the son of narrow-minded dissenters, and when his views broaden beyond the limits of his parents' intelligence, they throw him upon the world. He becomes a journeyman tailor, and suffers at the hands of the sweaters, against whom he is incensed less, to do him justice, for himself than on behalf of his fellow-sufferers. A model of perseverance, he contrives partially to educate himself; he writes poetry, a volume of which is published by subscription; and, by a miracle, he manages for a while to live by his pen. Through association with the Chartists he is innocently mixed up in a case of arson, and is sentenced to a term of imprisonment. The confinement affects his health, already undermined by hardship, and shortly after his release he dies. Like *Yeast*, *Alton Locke* is little more than a tract, but it is an incomparably better piece of work. It could not be more earnest than its forerunner, but, owing to the development of the author's

style, it takes a greater hold of the reader. Locke is, indeed, a puppet, but on the whole the characters are better defined and are more nearly alive. The second-hand bookseller, Mackaye, a man of flesh and blood, with a gruff manner, a tender heart, and a quaint, dry, generous humour, is a rare creation for Kingsley, who, with all his gifts, rarely gave evidence in his books of a sense of humour. There are exquisite descriptions of the country, terrible pen-pictures of the sweater's den, and a really dramatic scene when Farmer Porter tracks his son to the sweaters' den and rescues him.

The earnestness in these books is tremendous. Indeed, Kingsley seems to have spent himself as regards Christian Socialism during this period, for he gradually broke away from it, and wrote no more about the evils besetting the poor, though he retained until the end an academic interest in social reform. He was, as a matter of fact, not the reformer *par excellence*; with him it was merely a phase, and the subject held him only when he was under the influence of stronger men. After the publication of *Alton Locke* he soon ceased to be an active agitator, and gradually settled down as Tory as most of his brother clergymen. In later life he, as Sir Leslie Stephen has recorded, believed fervently in the House of Lords, detested the Manchester School, and was opposed to most of the radical programme. He did not approve of any revolutionary movement, and trusted to the Legislature to do what was right and necessary. Indeed, after these early outbursts of enthusiasm, his attitude was not far removed from *laissez faire*.

The literary life of Kingsley falls naturally into two divisions; the first period, that of the social reformer, ending with the publication of *Alton Locke*; the second, that of the historical novelist. In 1853 *Hypatia* appeared as a serial in *Fraser's Magazine*; and in the following year Kingsley, when he and his family were resident temporarily at Bideford, wrote *Westward Ho!* which was published in 1855. By that time he had returned to Eversley, where he produced *Two Years Ago*, which appeared in 1857. This is a story of the Crimean war, and in this he introduced as Tom Turnall, a young brother, George Henry, who had in 1848 been active in fighting an outbreak of cholera in England. In 1863 he published *The Water Babies*, which he called "a fairy tale for land babies," which has secured a recognised place in the very small body of first-rate literature for children. In *The Water Babies* are the well-known verses, "Young and Old," which begin:—

"When all the world is young, lad,
And all the trees are green,
And every goose a swan, lad,
And every lass a queen!"

Kingsley always has a taste for poetry. He wrote some charming verses full of tenderness—amongst these, "The Sands of Dee" and "The Fishers Went Sailing"; but more characteristic of the man, because more impetuous, were his "Ode to the North-East Wind" and "The Outlaw." His third and last historical novel, *Hereward the Wake*, a tale of the days of the Con-

queror, appeared in 1866. In 1860 he had been appointed Professor of Modern History at Cambridge, in succession to Sir James Stephen, and he held this post for nine years. After his retirement from the Professorship, in 1869, he visited the West Indies, at the invitation of Sir Arthur Gordon, then the Governor of Trinidad, and on his return recorded his impressions in a volume entitled *At Last*. In this year he was appointed a Canon of Chester, and in 1873 a Canon of Westminster. He died on January 23rd, 1875, and five days later was buried in the churchyard at Eversley.

Kingsley's historical novels were very popular when they appeared, and attracted a wide circle of readers. Not one of them, however, can be put forward as entitled to rank with the best historical fiction. They smack unpleasantly of the midnight oil. The author who was never at any time an exact student of the subjects in which he was interested, read up for his purpose with more enthusiasm than diligence the period he had selected. He lacked the dramatic gift which was the priceless possession of Scott. He never acquired the knowledge of the period about which he wrote that is behind *The Cloister and the Hearth*; nor did he ever succeed in imbuing himself with the atmosphere as did Thackeray before writing *Esmond* and *Denis Duval*. The books, indeed, were not written from out the rich stores in his mind; he stored his mind to write the books. He had a sense of romance; but he never achieved the grand manner of the masters of the craft. His historical novels lack the sincerity that inspired *Yeast* and *Alton Locke*.

Of Kingsley's later books only *Hypatia* and *Westward Ho!* call for serious attention. *Hypatia*, in spite of much that is good, must be written down as an ambitious failure. Indeed, the author, in a preface, whilst setting forth the difficulties against which he had to contend when dealing with such a subject, is at pains to explain why it does not lend itself to presentment in the form of a novel intended to appeal to a wide public. If, as he admits, even the sins of the Christians cannot be unfolded to the popular eye, and the crimes of the heathens must be drastically bowdlerised, then it is obvious that his picture of the age, subjected to such limitations, may make the background of a readable romance, but cannot possibly be acceptable to those who in an historical novel require a reasonable degree of realism. It is a curious thing that in a tale designed to depict "the last struggle between the Young Church and the Old World," written by a Christian clergyman, strong in sympathy with the followers of his creed, the heart of the reader goes out to a heathen and a Jew. When Kingsley deals with Wulf the "grand manner" encompasses him. When that fine old heathen, having been persuaded to accept baptism, was in the act of stepping into the font, he turned suddenly to the Bishop, and asked where were the souls of his ancestors? "In hell," replied the worthy prelate. Thereupon Wulf drew back, and threw his bearskin cloak around him. . . . "He would prefer," he said, "if Adolf had no objection, to go to his own people." Even a footnote, stating that this is "a

fact," does not destroy the effect. Then, too, the dying outburst of Miriam, the pander, who has toiled and hoarded and lied and intrigued for the benefit of her son, is true poetry: "Of the House of Jesse, of the seed of Solomon—not a Rabbi from Babylon to Rome dare deny that! A King's daughter am I, and a King's heart I had, and have, like Solomon's own, my son." Miriam is the truest portrait ever drawn by Kingsley; but the companion picture of her son, Raphael-ben-Ezra, is a failure. Raphael has his pride of race, daring, courage, and tenderness. He surrenders wealth, and all that wealth meant in those days, and goes forth into the desert, penniless and alone. But his conversion to Christianity does not ring true—the history of Judaism of that period shows that its votaries did not, even for the love of woman, abandon their faith. The fact is, Kingsley was always a propagandist. In *Hypatia* he was naturally on the side of the Christians against the infidels, and, ranking a Jew only above an infidel, and having created a noble Jew he could not bring himself to give him his heart's desire until he had converted him to Christianity. Similarly, in *Westward Ho*, Kingsley ranged himself with the Protestants and against the Roman Catholics. His heroes are Protestants, his villain a Roman Catholic. This might happen with any novelist, but with Kingsley it was a foregone conclusion.

Westward Ho! is certainly the best book that Kingsley wrote. A delight to boys, it seems to the more sophisticated reader just a little artificial in its love-scenes and in the Spenserian conception of the Noble Brotherhood of the Rose. The "Court talk" of Frank Leigh, his affectations, and his interminable harangues may be quite in the spirit of the period, but it is all extraordinarily wearisome. A far greater creation is Salvation Yeo, a finely conceived character, but the episode of the "Little Maid" leaves at least the present writer cold. Rose Salterne is true to life—a minx—but one sympathises with her when she elopes with the Spaniard, and thus escapes the tedious attention of the members of the Brotherhood founded in her honour. If Kingsley, lover of Devonshire as he is, never manages to convey the love of his land with such passion as Sir Henry Newbolt in his verses, there are admirable descriptive passages in the book, not only of the mother-country, but of tropical lands which the author has never seen but with which he was partially acquainted through his natural history studies. The merit of the book is in those parts where adventures are to the fore. Then there is a dash and a spirit that Kingsley never reached in any other of his tales. The deeds of derring-do in the South Seas and on the Spanish Main, and the story of the defeat of the great Armada are admirably told, and are comparable with similar episodes in the best works of any other author. There Kingsley is at his best, and his best is very good indeed. He is no longer the somewhat pedestrian novelist spinning out his tale, but a man writing from his heart, pouring out his soul in admiration of the great English seamen of the sixteenth century who laid the foundation of British sea-power.

LEWIS MELVILLE.

THE ILLIBERAL NATURE OF THE ANTI-VIVISECTION AGITATION.

THE possibility of Sir Frederick Banbury's "Dogs' Protection Bill" passing the House of Commons successfully and becoming law has naturally provoked a controversy which is not confined to the merits or demerits of the Bill. The whole question of experiments on living animals is again under discussion. And rightly so, for it cannot be maintained that dogs have a greater claim to a special protection than many other animals. The horse is more useful and the cat is preferred by many as a familiar. The passage of the present Bill would be not merely an unqualified triumph for the anti-vivisectionists; it would establish the principle that to seek knowledge by experiments on living animals is wrong. In the discussion which follows, therefore, the Bill will not be considered; the general question of vivisection will be dealt with.

The usual form which any public discussion of the subject takes is well illustrated in the present newspaper controversy. Anti-vivisectionists—to adopt the descriptive name they themselves use—object to experiments on animals principally on moral grounds, and alternatively on the belief that the knowledge which has been gained by vivisection is useless, if not actually misleading and harmful. The moral principle, which they believe is broken by vivisectionists, is defined differently by the numerous leaders of the public agitation. One of the best known anti-vivisectionists defined it recently in the columns of the *Times* as follows: "The moral question with us is that to torture a dog for any purpose whatever is a wicked act, and that the most radiant prospective benefits promised us from such an act do not justify it." By the word "torture" is no doubt meant to inflict severe pain of short duration or less severe but more prolonged pain; and I suppose the word animal may be substituted for dog. The phrase "for any purpose whatever" should be noted. Vivisectionists, to use a word which is convenient though it covers a moral equivocation, deny this proposition. They affirm that it is not immoral to inflict pain on animals in order to save man from pain; and they produce evidence of the most diverse kind to prove that men have been saved pain and suffering by the application of knowledge gained in the laboratory.

This, I believe, is a fairly accurate summary of the rival contentions. It is rare that the basic arguments are clearly opposed. Vivisectionists are principally anxious to prove that mankind has derived immense benefits from the practice of vivisection. They have little difficulty in doing this. But their evidence is either denied *in toto* by their opponents or its meaning is subtly changed by skilfully chosen quotations from current contentious scientific writings. There is nothing easier than this in public controversy on a scientific subject. Men of science are their own severest critics; they alone realise the extreme difficulty of interpreting new facts. Conflict of opinion is almost a condition of progress in

science, and to one who is not an investigator—to an outsider in short—the opinion of one scientist is as good as that of another. It is easy, therefore, for a hostile critic to match one set of statistics against another set, to quote the opinion of one expert to rebut that of another. The method leads to endless argument and a general confusion which throws into relief the supposed moral question of the anti-vivisectors. Accomplished writers, whose enthusiasm for excellence is greater than their zeal for truth, and whose power of expression has been cultivated at the expense of real knowledge, complete the confusion by a liberal contribution of perverse witticisms and false analogies. The vivisector seeks an escape from the *impasse* by some bold and sweeping declaration. He may declare, for example, that the whole of modern medicine is based on vivisection; that any progress made by clinical observation is subsequently refined, made more exact, by laboratory experiment. And this is largely true though the proof of it requires a long and arduous study which is only undertaken by the specialist. But the word of the specialist, however eminent he be, is not accepted by the general public when it is believed that a moral question is involved. We accept the considered opinion of the astronomer or the physicist; we expect our newspapers to make mild fun of some investigations, a certain proof of respect in England; but then the subject matter of astronomy does not appear to affect us immediately. There is no moral issue in it. This quality in scientific medicine is thoroughly exploited by the anti-vivisector.

The general result of such disputes is to place the vivisectors in a class apart from their fellow-citizens. They are the modern monks who spend their time not in good works or in classic learning but in devising diabolical tortures on helpless brutes. The picture is wholly false. Vivisectors are affected as much as any other section of the community by the action and interaction of public opinion. They form no class; their individual tastes and interests differ widely. Some have literary interests and some not; some play golf and some despise golf. They have the usual characteristics of the modern Englishman and share all his horror of needless cruelty. They claim no privileges which others do not enjoy. In short, they are subjects of the king, citizens of the commonwealth, sharing in its common burdens and expecting only the rights which other men enjoy. It is upon this level of the common liberties and rights of a British citizen that the case for vivisection must be judged.

The right to use animals for our benefit is conceded by all normal men. We may use them to spare us labour; we may eat them as food. We may inflict pain, severe or mild, provided the purpose for which it is done is well understood and approved by the social conscience. Public opinion sanctions the use of horses in war, knowing well that they are maimed by shells, poisoned by noxious gases and tortured by tetanus and gas gangrene, all for the benefit solely of man. It permits the docking of dogs' tails, the castration of lambs, of horses, and of cats. Painful operations are performed on sick animals without the use of anæsthetics. The purpose for

which such pain is inflicted is understood and approved. We are limited, it is true, and rightly limited in certain directions by law. Cruelty is punished and an elaborate organisation is set up to discover those who infringe the law. Public opinion loathes the unnecessary infliction of pain on dumb beasts. But where the necessity can be proved the right to inflict pain is granted. Any citizen of the country is permitted to castrate a colt because the object of the operation is understood and its advantages are admitted. At the present time it is not compulsory to administer an anæsthetic. The owner of the colt is careful to select a competent and skilled operator because his would be the loss in an unsuccessful operation. Here the motive is pure gain, and all men admit the right to pursue profit. A bitch may be prevented from having puppies, and this cannot be said to be pleasant to the bitch. But the purpose of the restraint is again well understood and approved; convenience and comfort are not to be despised. The instances might be multiplied, but these serve to show that the infliction of pain is admitted as right when the object sought is approved by reason and common sense.*

Let us turn to the question of vivisection and examine how these general principles affect the practice. I write as one licensed to perform experiments on living animals; I accept the term vivisector as a matter of convenience. The law permits operations and experiments on animals under a complicated system of licences and certificates. Cutting operations may be performed only when the animal is under the influence of an anæsthetic. Certain animals are especially protected, the dog and cat among others. An inspectorate is established to ensure that the law is carried out. There is clearly, therefore, no difference in the practice of vivisection from the ordinary treatment of animals by the general community except that (1) the vivisector must use anæsthetics for painful operations—he is compelled to do so by the nature of his enquiries, apart altogether from the law; (2) he must kill animals in pain (with a common-sense reservation); and (3) he must house, warm, and feed his animals by a standard higher than is compulsory to any other owner of animals.

Why then, one may reasonably ask, is the practice of vivisection so persistently opposed and so bitterly attacked by a small section of the community? Why is the agitation tolerated by the general public which certainly would not permit a similar agitation against commercial practices which incontestably involve more suffering? The answer, I think, is to be found in the difference in purpose, which is not often defined. The vivisector seeks knowledge in the laboratory; the farmer seeks profit when he castrates the lamb, the dog-lover seeks an æsthetic pleasure when he docks his terrier's tail. At least it might be claimed that the object which the man of science pursues is not lower than that of the dog-lover.

The truth of this can be illustrated by referring to well-known

* This is not intended as a defence of the public standard. Col. Guinness' Bill now before Parliament is strongly supported by the medical M.P.s. It is felt that those who inflict pain for commercial gain should be compelled to adopt a higher standard, approaching that set by vivisectors.

facts. If a vivisector wished to study the remote effects of castration—the effects, for example, on the thyroid gland—and in the pursuit of such knowledge performed the necessary operation, with or without anæsthetics, on cats without first obtaining a licence and the special certificates issued for the purpose, he would be visited with legal penalties. His operation would be defined as an experiment, a designed attempt to enlarge human knowledge, and therefore requiring legal sanction. But the same man, or for that matter any man, may perform the same operation on as many animals as he cares if it be done for profit in the wide sense of the word.

It might be supposed that this is a hypothetical instance unlikely to occur; a mere pushing of the logic of the written word to limits not likely in practice to be reached. This is not so. It is a plain unvarnished statement of what has actually happened. Not many years ago a distinguished man of science was deprived of his licence for the period of a year for performing—in the pursuit of knowledge—in a humane and painless manner this actual operation which is carried out daily in every large town by clumsy untrained hands.

The preparation of sera for use against such diseases as diphtheria and tetanus involves the inoculation of bacterial poisons into horses and subsequent bleeding. Precisely similar operations must be carried out on a small scale, on rabbits and guinea-pigs usually, in the experimental work upon which the process is based. To take an actual instance, I shall refer to a war disease. In the early days of the war a fairly large percentage of wounded men developed a very fatal wound disease known as gas gangrene. Bacteriologists discovered the cause of the disease; it is due to the growth and multiplication of certain germs in wounds. They secrete poisons which have been shown to produce in the lower animals similar effects to those observed in the unfortunate wounded soldier. It was subsequently discovered that animals, inoculated with small, non-killing doses of these poisons, acquired an immunity to the malady. The knowledge was at once utilised to prepare sera on a large scale to protect our troops.

The work clearly falls into two parts: the preliminary experimental part and the commercial application of the knowledge gained. There is practically no difference in the amount of pain inflicted in the two stages, and the suffering caused, though definite, is slight. In the experimental work the experimenter must be a trained and qualified man, licensed by the Home Office for the work; the second part of the work may be done by unlicensed men who are not compelled by law to be trained and qualified, though in actual practice they are very skilled men. Clearly, therefore, the pursuit of knowledge is watched over as an evil thing, whilst the application of the knowledge gained is left to the good sense of those who apply it for profit.

It has already been noted in the quotation of the anti-vivisector's moral question that it is wicked to "torture" a dog for any purpose whatever. If this be taken literally the farmer who works for profit is guilty of wickedness equally with the dog-lover who docks his

terrier's tail. The State which uses horses in war is weighted with guilt. But we all know that when the safety of the State is at issue animals have no rights, and to a far-seeing man the security of social organisation as we know it is only maintained by a ceaseless vigilance and a constant endeavour to understand beneficent and inimical natural forces alike. It would be easy to understand and to respect an agitation against the infliction of pain on animals for any purpose; it would have the merit of consistency and we should all believe that the agitators were inspired by a love of animals. We should not respect their indifference to human-kind, and the impatient would doubt their sanity, but all men would understand the objects of the agitation. What, let me ask, might have been done by a "League to protect animals from pain" during the last five years? It would have protested against the use of horses and mules, of dogs, and of pigeons in the war. Earnest members of the league would have shared the prison cell with conscientious objectors. The overburdened statesmen at the Peace Conference would have been deluged with telegrams demanding a clause in a new Geneva Convention expressly forbidding the employment of animals in possible future wars. The greatly daring, ardent spirits of this imaginary league might have imitated the tactics of the Suffragettes. Never again would horses drag guns under shell fire, or charge barbed-wire fences in face of streams of machine-gun bullets.

But the anti-vivisectionists are not the people to make such bold claims. They sat quiet during the war knowing full well that animals were being maimed and tortured in the war area. They formed a Blue Cross Society, it is true, whose object was to mitigate the sufferings of horses—not trusting the Army Veterinary Corps, I suppose; but that is much like providing the angler with a pot of ointment to rub on the gills of fishes taken by the hook. They were aware, I have no doubt, that very large numbers of animals were used in experiments on protective devices against, and in tests of the lethal powers of, poison gases. But they uttered no word of protest, so far as I am aware, a proof either of moral cowardice or of indifference to the infliction of pain.

The truth of the matter is that the anti-vivisectionist agitation is an illiberal movement. It is directed simply against the acquisition of knowledge. Its members have no higher conception of the place of animals in human society than have other men; their moral sensibilities are not more refined. They dislike only one thing, and that is modern science.

W. E. BULLOCK, M.D.

HINDRANCES TO BELIEF IN IMMORTALITY.

DEATH has been called "the great commonplace," but it is a commonplace that never fails to awaken our astonishment.

And perhaps never so poignantly as to-day has this challenge stirred the hearts of men. The premature cutting off of millions that formed the flower of the race has, as might be expected, created the most painful reactions in the general mind, and men are asking to-day as they have never asked before: What is Death? Is there anything beyond the veil? If there is something, what is it? Bitter and painful experiences are driving multitudes to question themselves, and even in professedly religious circles, the tragic fact is that the oracles are dumb, and no articulate answer is forthcoming. All unconsciously to themselves, their traditional faith in a future life has been slowly undermined, and when the day of adversity has come, they find themselves without a refuge, staring into the black pit of despair. Doubtless in all ages belief in immortality has been shadowed with difficulty and misgiving. The obvious phenomena of death, the inability of the mind to visualise the transition from an incarnate to a discarnate state, or to picture the form which life assumes in the world beyond—these have always been sinister arguments even among the uncultivated. Moreover, immortality has from time to time shared the fate of other great beliefs, such as God and Freedom, in accordance with the ruling forces of any given age. In the period of the Enlightenment, for example, which taught man's native ability to obey the moral law, the autonomy of his will, and in a word his moral independence, it is clear that a doctrine of immortality formulated in terms of rewards and punishments, could have no standing. What need of such extraneous supports, if man has the power to become virtuous of himself, and has an inborn tendency to realise the good? No wonder that the century which had identified immortality with a scheme of "prize-morality" should find the first incredible when it found the second superfluous.

Now if we look back on the past fifty or sixty years, we shall find, in addition to those fundamental handicaps to belief arising from the domination exercised over us by the senses and the failure of imagination to conceive or picture the immaterial, certain specific causes which account for the present widespread doubt and denial. These causes, I believe, will be found to be three: (1) The breakdown of religious authority as embodied in codes and laws and institutions, and more specifically, the dissolution of the traditional forms in which faith in immortality has been expressed, under the combined influence of advancing ethical insight and deeper knowledge of the New Testament. (2) The rise of modern materialism which, in the popular mind, is bound up with the triumphs of natural science; and more particularly, that form of materialism which finds in consciousness simply a function of the brain, and therefore sharing the fate of the brain. (3) The rise and spread of

Socialism among the wage-earning classes, and more especially the doctrine of Karl Marx and his followers, with its materialistic conception of history and its resultant denial of spirit in man.

I.—THE BREAKDOWN OF THE TRADITIONAL FORM OF THE IMMORTAL HOPE.

Whatever theory we may hold as to the origin of the belief in a future life—and it is probable that this origin is to be found in the ghosts which visited the dreams of savage men—it is not to be denied that the belief itself has sunk its roots deep in the soil of religion and has drawn thence its tenacity and power. Hence it has become a *religious* phenomenon, and the hope which it offers to the human heart is shaped by the specific religion in which it appears. Hence we may say: as is the religion so is the faith in immortality; the higher the religion the more spiritual is its doctrine of the future.

Now when we turn to the Christian religion we are at once struck by the contrast between the teaching of its Founder and that of His disciples. The characteristic features of Christ's treatment of the question are unwavering and sublime assurances of the fact of immortality with great reserve as to its nature and precise conditions. Only a few of His sayings and two or three of His parables enshrine His convictions about human destiny. Yet He has so transfigured the beliefs and conceptions of all who had gone before Him that Christianity has been justly called the religion of immortality. The Paradox is resolved when we remember that it was not His teaching only but far more his post-mortem appearances to His followers that created the dynamic of His religion. Over against the apparent meagreness of Christ's words, stands the rich luxuriance of visions and doctrines and hopes as seen reflected in the writings of evangelist and apostle. Around the simple belief in continued communion with God beyond death, there gathered in the course of time a complicated series of beliefs, taken over for the most part from Jewish tradition and environment, and handed down to the modern world as moral and religious truth. It is the presence of this Jewish Apocalyptic element in the teaching of the churches that explains why so many turn away from all thought about the future life as futile and hopeless. "People do not believe in a future life," writes a well-known Anglican scholar, "because the forms in which the belief has been presented to their minds, seem, on the one hand, to be intellectually untenable, and on the other, to be unattractive or even repellent. Traditional pictures of Hell seem morally revolting; while the Heaven of Sunday School teaching or popular hymnology is a place which the plain man does not believe to exist, and which he would not want to go to, if it did."* Doubtless the symbols of the Book of Revelation, with its pearly gates and golden streets, its strange and monstrous animal figures, its emphasis on ecstatic worship as the sole occupation of the heavenly world, in brief, its non-human quality of life, has had much to do with the present revolt against ecclesiastical teach-

* B. H. Streeter in *Essays on Immortality*, p. 135.

ing about a state of future existence. A singular confirmation of this judgment is supplied in a private letter of an American soldier who was a member of the Foreign Legion and who laid down his life in the war. He writes as follows:—

“Living as we do, with death as a constant companion, has but deepened my conviction of something after this life. But it has destroyed my belief (what belief I may have had) in the conventional heaven and hell of theology. With all reverence, I can think of nothing more deadly than an eternity devoted to singing, playing and adoration. A man’s soul must include his capacity for action, work, his creative faculties, I think; to me our power to imagine and create is one of the evidences of God in us. That, and the numbers of young men just on the threshold of their creative life—musicians, writers, painters—men who could look at a river and vision and build power plants and factories; yes, soldiers who could look at a map and vision armies in place and manœuvring—these men, killed, utterly destroyed in a second by a few ounces of explosives, have made impossible the belief that all that their minds held is definitely lost to humanity. I believe that death is followed by life as sunset is followed by sunrise, but by a life much more closely related to this one than theological dogma would have us believe. . . .”

But other and deeper causes have been at work.

To begin with, thoughtful persons have come to see that death has been over-estimated. Its significance for man’s spiritual history has occupied too great a place in thought and feeling. How many earnest spirits like Dr. Johnson have been all their lifetime subject to bondage through the fear that death settled their moral status in the universe for all eternity! Popular thought conceives of death as ushering in the soul to the presence of the Judge of all, there to undergo trial and receive fit sentence. Thus death which is an episode in the physical order, a biological event, is transformed into a spiritual process, with resultant illusions and confusions both in thought and life. Yet a little reflection would show the unreality of this way of picturing the meaning of death. If here and now on “this bank and shoal of time” I am not in the presence of God, then nowhere throughout the entire cosmos can I ever find Him, or feel His eye on me. Five minutes after death where am I? From the standpoint of spiritual reality, precisely where I was five minutes before death. Doubtless death as a physical process, like all other physical processes, affects the life of the spirit, for it implies that the physical organism has been dropped, and that life is lived under new conditions. But it is one thing to say this and another and a very different thing to say that a bodily event has power to work as by magic a profound transformation in all man’s spiritual relationships, in the very texture of the soul-life. This is to assert what cannot stand the scrutiny of ethics or of science. And when traditional theology passes beyond death and tries to forecast the history of the soul in the after-world, it forms a scheme or frame-work within which for ages the hopes and fears of men have moved, but from which the majority of educated people to-day turn away in utter disbelief.

They cannot say with Dante that the pillars of an enduring Hell have been built upon the love and justice of God. They do not believe in eternal torture, that is, in pain that has no meaning and no end, nor do they find credible the resurrection of the physical body, or a final Day of Judgment on which human history will be finally wound up, to be followed by a static Heaven and Hell, or a Purgatory that is at once artificial and unethical. If the after-life is to be worthy of man's reverent trust and hope, it can only be by our applying to it those moral categories which have been found to work in our experience here and now. One of these great formative principles is that of growth. Man's personality is never a finished article; it is a growing organism. Now to suppose that the world beyond the grave is the scene of irrevocable woe or bliss in which a man enters at death is to suppose something that offends the moral sense, because it contradicts all that which our experience in this world certifies. As Dr. James Ward remarks: "That a man should pass at once from earth to heaven or hell seems irrational and inequitable; and the lapse of ages of suspended consciousness, if this were conceivable, would not diminish this discontinuity."* Nor is the official doctrine of Purgatory in any better case. For this doctrine is *not* the rational and acceptable view of Plato which reappears in the teaching of such men as Clement of Alexandria and Origen that the suffering in Purgatory is disciplinary and is profitable for the correction of morally imperfect habits and for the purification from the stains contracted through the defilements of this life; it is the irrational and unacceptable theory that at death souls destined for Heaven are in the very instant of death morally transformed, wholly turned away from all evil and wholly given to all good, but pass into Purgatory for a space to expiate in pain the debt which they owe to the justice of God for the sins committed in their past life. These theories of popular religious thought, whether Roman or Protestant, are no longer possible to cultivated men, because they deny that the history of the soul is an organic development in which there is a continuity between the higher and the lower stages of being, and in which spiritual progress is inconceivable apart from decisions and choices of the moral will. The most clamant need at the present time in the sphere of religion is a bold and vigorous effort at reconstructing the current conceptions of the future life, by sweeping as rubbish to the void the fictions and fallacies of Judaic imagination stimulated by Pagan thought, and by building a fresh and still more compelling and realistic view of man's destiny upon the teaching of Christ and of those who stood nearest Him in spirit, and upon the nature of man's higher life as disclosed by modern reflection. And those who reject belief in survival because they no longer expect to hear the trumpet blast heralding the Last Day, or to see a great white throne with its apparitors of doom, or to emerge from the grave clad in a body which they had laid aside not without some measure of relief, may be reminded that faith in immortality was in possession ages before these thoughts entered the human mind, and therefore can exist when they have passed into the limbo of oblivion.

* *The Realm of Ends*, p. 406.

II.—THE RISE AND INFLUENCE OF SCIENTIFIC MATERIALISM.

Materialism or the doctrine that all phenomena, whether physical or psychical, are phenomena of matter in motion, has behind it a long history, going back to the speculations of the ancient Greek philosophers, Empedocles and Democritus, and finding its poet in the Roman Lucretius whose motive in writing his work "On the Nature of Things" was to free men from the fear of Orcus with its eternal gloom and suffering, by showing that the soul, made of attenuated matter, vanished when its constituent particles were dissolved. In the nineteenth century Tyndall startled his contemporaries by his assertion that in matter was to be discerned "the promise and potency of every form and quality of life." The history of the universe has been the history of atoms in motion, and within these atoms lie all the forces that create light, heat, electricity, and so forth, each being convertible into the rest. Everything that has come to be, mental or physical, lay germinally in the primeval atom. The modern phase of the doctrine substitutes units of electricity for the hard atoms of the older thinkers. But this does not alter the essence of the argument. These ultimate entities constitute the stuff of which the universe is made. The concentration of so many brilliant minds on the physical sciences, and the resultant emphasis on the mechanical aspect of nature, combined with the revolutionary doctrine of Darwin, which seemed to complete the materialistic argument by the proof that man has been developed by an endless number of minute variations in virtue of the law of natural selection from his pre-human ancestry, threatened to sweep the last generation off its feet, and to make materialism triumphant among all educated people. But idealism in a variety of forms during the past quarter of a century, has, it is claimed, turned the tide, and on all sides we are assured that materialism is dead or dying, at most dragging out a precarious existence in quarters innocent of philosophical speculation, and ignorant of the real situation in the higher thought of our time. A lecturer in connection with the Ethical Culture Movement has recently told us that "no longer is it left to theology to decry materialism. Science herself has sounded its death knell. To-day it is difficult to find a genuinely scientific champion of its thesis as it was fifty years ago to find an opponent."* An Anglican theologian in a book just published assures us that "materialism is a 'creed out-worn.' Fifty years ago, when physical science was making such rapid advances, it was fashionable. To-day it has ceased to be fashionable and is thoroughly discredited."† The writer of the article on "Materialism," in Baldwin's "Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology," avers that "materialism as a dogmatic system hardly survives in philosophical circles, although in alliance with Secularism and Socialism it is, no doubt, influential among certain sections of the working classes, and often forms the creed of the half-educated specialist."‡ "In dogmatic form," writes Dr. F. R. Tennant, "materialism is to be found to-day, perhaps, only in the literature of secularist 'free' thought. Even the monism

* *Faith in a Future Life*, by A. Martin, p. 44.

† *Christianity and Immortality*, by V. Storr, p. 23.

‡ *Hastings' Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, Art. *Materialism*.

of E. Haeckel, which is materialism in all but name, awakes no enthusiasm among scientific students in Britain, and is rightly regarded as involving an obsolete standpoint." There can be no doubt that these writers are serious thinkers who not only believe what they say, but have grounds for their belief. Yet it is no less certain that materialism was never more rampant in scientific circles than it is to-day. It was an ancient saying that when three physicians met two were found to be atheists; substitute the word "materialists" for "atheists" and you will not be far from the truth. Owing to the ill odour now attaching to materialism, as though it involved a certain moral opprobrium, scientific men do not care to label themselves with the name, but that they are firmly persuaded of the doctrine and teach it to the youth who attend our medical schools may be reckoned as certain. "Almost any of our young psychologists will tell you," says James, "that only a few belated scholastics, or possibly some crack-brained theosophist or psychical researcher can be found holding back, and still talking as if mental phenomena might exist as independent variables in the world."* But the matter has been recently put to the test in a genuinely scientific style. Professor J. H. Leuba, the well-known American psychologist, sent out a questionnaire to groups selected from published lists of American scientists and psychologists, and philosophers, with a view to discover how far the belief in God and Immortality still prevailed among the educated classes, more particularly in college and university circles. Of those who answered the questions it was found that 49.4 per cent., among the physical and biological scientists taken together, declared themselves either disbelievers or doubters in regard to belief in immortality. Of the more eminent as distinguished from men of lesser reputation, only 36.9 proclaimed themselves believers. The biologists produced a much smaller number of believers than the physicists, 50 per cent. being credited to the latter, 57 per cent. to the former. Of the men of greater standing among the biologists only 25 per cent. avowed their belief in a future life. Another interesting and significant fact emerged. Whereas among the physicists and biologists the number of believers in immortality was substantially larger than that of the believers in God, among the psychologists the number of believers in immortality was clearly less than that of the believers in God, 24 per cent. asserting their belief in God, and 19.8 per cent. their belief in immortality. Among the greater psychologists the number of believers in immortality sank to 8.8 per cent. Professor Leuba concludes that "in the present phase of psychological science, the greater one's knowledge of psychic life the more difficult it is to retain the traditional belief in the continuation of personality after death." To put the results of the investigation briefly, more than half of all those who replied to the questions addressed to them, and over two-thirds of the more eminent of these rejected belief in immortality.† These ascertained facts prove that the reassuring

* *Human Immortality*, pp. 9, 10.

† *The Belief in God and Immortality*, by James H. Leuba, pp. 173-281. Dr. Leuba was unable to get any reliable results from his enquiries in philosophical quarters, as he was unable to formulate his questions in such a way as to get from the philosophers clear answers.

utterances of men of philosophical distinction as to the passing of materialism require critical discrimination. Enquiry and statistical study prove the prevalence of denial of survival in scientific circles as the result of psycho-physiological knowledge implying materialism, and yet sincere and thoughtful men assure us that this doctrine is thoroughly discredited except among the half-educated and scientific amateurs.

How is this apparent contradiction to be explained? The answer is that the term "materialism" is ambiguous and covers ideas that have no intrinsic connection. Materialism as a theory of knowledge has been vanquished by idealism and may be said to be dead, but materialism as a psycho-physiological solution of the problem of mind and brain was never more alive in scientific circles than it is to-day. The old doctrine that nothing is mind except what enters through the senses, was shown to be false by proving that mind had powers which the senses were not adequate to explain. The intellect can rise above the individual perceptions, and we can grasp them as an intelligible whole. Such an act may well be called "creative"—an act quite impossible to the senses. Sensationalism, then, has vanished from the realm of debate, and in that sense materialism has had its day and has ceased to be. But the scientific materialist does not wince at this philosophic victory. For he is not concerned about the nature of knowledge; such a problem he hands over to the metaphysician. What concerns him is to frame an hypothesis, in harmony with scientific method, which will render intelligible the relation of mind to the bodily organism. And this hypothesis can be expressed in a sentence: *consciousness is a function of the brain*. It cannot be denied that the facts are on the materialistic side. Universal experience testifies that consciousness is always associated with a physical organism, weakens when the organism weakens, is impaired when the organism is impaired, and finally disappears when the organism perishes under the stroke of death. It is true that the materialist cannot prove that consciousness is destroyed by death, but why, he asks, should consciousness persist when the other functions, the various chemistries of the body, are stilled for ever? Now, that the full strength of the negative argument may appear, it may be well to hear what some of its champions have to say in its defence. "The laws connecting consciousness with changes in the brain are very definite and precise and their necessary consequences are not to be evaded. . . . Consciousness is a *complex thing* made up of elements—a stream of feelings. The action of the brain is also a *complex thing* made up of elements—a stream of nerve-messages. . . . If an individual feeling always goes with an individual nerve-message, if a combination or stream of feelings always goes with a stream of nerve-messages, does it now follow that when the stream of nerve-messages is broken up, this stream of feelings will be broken up also, and will no longer form consciousness?"* Haeckel points to the discovery that in the grey matter of the brain are located not only the seats of the central sense-organs, the spheres of touch, smell, sense and hearing, but between these the great

* W. K. Clifford : *Lectures and Essays*, Vol. I., pp. 247-249.

organs of mental life, the highest instruments of psychic activity that produce thought and consciousness;* and throughout his discussion he assumes as not open to dispute that when this complex mechanism ceases to function, all mental activity perishes. That the organisation of mind advances with even pace along with the organisation of brain, is the merest commonplace. The fortunes of mind and brain are so interwoven at every moment that to the scientific observer it is incredible to suppose the escape of consciousness from the shattered elements of the physical organ. The general thesis of the mind's dependence on the body is buttressed in detail by the researches of the physiologist and the psychologist. "The phenomena of consciousness correspond, element for element, to the operations of special parts of the brain. . . . The destruction of any piece of the apparatus involves the loss of some one or other of the vital operations; and the consequence is that as far as life extends, we have before us only an organic function, with a *Ding-am-sich*, or an expression of that imaginary entity, the soul. The fundamental proposition . . . carries with it the denial of the immortality of the soul."†

Now, the point to be emphasised is that the brain is a highly complex structure in which a vast number of molecules are worked up into cells with all their marvellous ramifications, that with the break-up of this composite structure mind no longer exists. Consciousness appears with a physical complex called brain, and is never known to function apart from it. Must not consciousness disappear when this complex is dissolved? As John Fiske writes: "We have no more warrant in experience for supposing consciousness to exist without a nervous system than we have for supposing the properties of water to exist in a world destitute of hydrogen and oxygen."‡

It must be confessed that the answers made to this contention are far from satisfactory. The familiar argument of idealism, that matter is not an independent something prior to thought and a production of thought, but is real only in so far as it appears to mind, so that, if you abstract mind from matter, matter ceases to be—this argument appears to the scientific materialist to be a mere metaphysical puzzle or quibble, and he takes his stand on the principle that for practical purposes reality is directly perceived. The idealist's reasoning seems an airy nothing when confronted with the world of objective facts. Hence, to meet the new situation the materialist is pointed to the elements of mental and moral experience. No physical facts, it is maintained, can explain moral values and ideals. The higher the stage in human evolution, the more clearly appear in experience principles which imply that man has other and more vital interests than the maintenance of his physical existence. As a rational, self-conscious being, the shaper of his destiny, and the focus, so to say, of values that cannot be measured by any material standard, man stands outside the realm of mechanical necessity, and is not explicable in terms of brain

* *Riddle of the Universe*, p. 65.

† E. Dühring, quoted by W. James, *Human Immortality*, p. 50.

‡ *Everlasting Life*, p. 55.

molecules and nerve elements. This argument has been set forth with impressive eloquence and powerful dialectic in the writings of Professor Ward and Professor Pringle-Patterson. But much as it appeals to the student of ethics and philosophy, it fails to persuade the scientific materialist. For the demand of the student of physiology is for facts, observed phenomena which may compel him to modify his thesis of the mind's functional dependence on the body. In the absence of these facts, his hypothesis holds the ground, and no assertion of man's moral and spiritual dignity will avail. But the curious and startling feature of the present situation is that the idealist acts as if he suspected that he had achieved only a seeming victory over his antagonist. For, of course, materialism denies immortality, and if idealism had really inflicted ruinous defeat on its antagonist, would not the idealist proclaim to the world the fact of survival, and bid all men rejoice with him in the sure and certain hope that death is not the end? As a matter of fact, the idealist draws no such inference, in the great majority of cases. On the contrary, he warns us that undue emphasis on a future life augurs an unhealthy spiritual temperament; that, at best, the belief is secondary and inferential, and might even disappear, leaving all ethical and religious interests unaffected! The scientific materialist may well smile as he sees the *impasse* in which the philosopher finds himself, and he goes on his way, more than ever convinced that philosophy is a will-o'-the-wisp, and that for him the path of wisdom is that of observed fact and inductive method.

Out of his deadlock there is only one way. It is to refute the materialist by giving him what he professes to crave—that is to say, facts open to observation and experiment, just like the other facts which have created his negation. These facts are phenomena which go to prove that consciousness can function apart from the brain. For men of unscientific temper or of sternly ethical and religious instincts, such a proof may not be necessary—though, perhaps, desirable—but for the man who devotes his life to the study of brain states and corresponding mental states, in health and disease, facts alone have coercive power. Hence to this extent the problem of immortality is now a scientific one, and psychic research appears to be the only serious effort to face the situation. Only by the slow and tedious accumulation of facts tending to show that mind works independently of the physical organism, can the scientific materialist be met on his own ground and be compelled to surrender. It is highly significant that the latest defender* of the materialistic denial of immortality admits the reality of the phenomena of psychic research, but refers them to telepathic communication between living persons, apparently forgetting that this is to explain the obscure by the more obscure. Nevertheless, the admission is interesting; it is likely to prove the first rift in the rock-ribbed dogmatism of modern materialism.

III.—THE INFLUENCE OF MODERN SOCIALISM.

Perhaps no movement of the nineteenth century has been more potent in the life of vast masses of men than the rise and spread

* E. S. P. Haynes in *Belief in Immortality*.

of Socialism. Its most logical form is that of scientific Socialism as expounded by Karl Marx. To the strict Marxian, Socialism is not merely an economic doctrine; it is a philosophy of life and all its relationships. Speaking at the grave of Marx, his friend and co-worker, Engels, explained the Marxian "Materialistic corruption of history" to mean that the given "stage of economic evolution of a nation or epoch forms the foundation from which the civil institutions of the people in question, their ideas of law, of art, of religion even, have been developed and according to which they are to be explained—and not the reverse, as has been done hitherto." Strict Marxians, therefore, reject belief in immortality on the ground that it is merely a reflection of the economic situation of the people among whom it appears. With the establishment of the socialistic Utopia, the idea will wholly vanish. To be sure, all Socialists are not out and out Marxians. Indeed, the average Socialist, strange to say, is an unmitigated individualist in religion, holding apparently that while all other human motives and institutions are capable of being socialised, the deepest motive of all has no sociological function whatever! Unquestionably, the general trend of the movement has been to conceive of man too much as an economic, money-grabbing, food-getting animal. The wage-earner is engaged in the struggle for an existence. To him the things of pressing moment are food, clothing, shelter, houses, land. Socialism has shown him that these things depend on far-reaching international and financial conditions. In opposition to the teaching of many religious bodies that the supreme concern is the salvation of the soul which is quite independent of material conditions, Socialism tends to the other extreme, and so emphasises the improvement of external conditions as to obscure the inner meaning of man's being, his power to transcend circumstances, "to live a life beyond, to have a hope to die with dim-descried." The life beyond the grave can offer no economic return; therefore, it must be denied or relegated to the realm of the negligible. Moreover, the struggle for a redistribution of earthly goods and for a larger opportunity to get out of the present world what is in it, is so absorbing and exciting that any interest in the supersensuous realm distracts the attention from the real things, the solid and substantial realities of economics. In other words, as has been well said, "man is to be no longer, even in his holiday dreamings, an amphibious creature, longing somehow for the boundless ocean, but he is to be simply and exclusively a land-animal, a creature of earth alone." The economic interests of the proletariat loom so large as to eclipse the vision of another world. Moreover, Socialism offers itself as a substitute for the religion with which so many of the wage-earning class have broken in our time. It holds up the ideal of a socialistic state as an object worthy of reverence, commanding the utter devotion of our lives and the suppression of all other desires and ambitions. Now, as belief in immortality has become an essential element in religion as Western peoples know it, it is obvious that the growth of the socialistic idea has been hostile to its hold on large classes of the industrial populations of the world.

The remedy lies in a two-fold direction. The believer in immortality must show that his faith is not only compatible with but essential to a genuine reverence for all that bears on man's best life. And he must prove his faith by proving his interest in man's material well-being, the readjustment of social conditions, the provision of a larger economic and educational opportunity for the unprivileged masses. Any preoccupation with the other world which curtails our interest in establishing the Kingdom of God on earth wherein each shall work according to his ability, and to each shall be given according to his needs, will in the long run react harmfully on our conviction that not here but beyond must the destiny of man find its consummation.

And, on the other hand, the Socialist must be led to see that the implications of his creed are deeper than he suspects. No programme of economic reform, no realisation of materialistic dreams, can satisfy the ambitions of the human spirit that has once realised the import of liberty, equality, brotherhood, and caught a glimpse of the new world wherein dwelleth righteousness.

Such a belief is really mystical in character. For man is now seen to belong to a grander order than that of earth; he is the bearer of eternal values; he escapes our economic categories and stands forth in his true being as the citizen of a transcendent world who, here and now, is passing through a preparatory discipline, and after each task is done, is haunted by a divine unrest that urges him on to find his goal beyond the limitations of his terrestrial lot. It is paradoxical but true that the more super-earthly man appears to be, the more sacred become all his temporal interests and strivings.

SAMUEL McCOMB.

THE REVOLT OF THE HIDDEN HAND.

THE visits of the German bombers to London taught us all, as never before, to recognise and, in recognising, to reverence the regularity of the moon and the efficiency of its service to mankind. Its utter disregard, not to say unconsciousness, of even the most unprecedented and calamitous of mundane events, its ever unflurried, unfailing entry, passage, and exit, its calm-sailing, pellucid, silvery-shining progress, unstayed and unstinted and altogether majestic, through the heavens, it is which makes it a member of our sacred trio of the institutions, at once permanent and glorious, imperative to our being. This metaphor comes to us aptly and justly as we ponder how to bring home to the reader the hub-like position and the constancy, the precision, the reliability, the sovereign value, and the indispensability of the body of men, far from inconsiderable even in number, who have lately resolved to play a prominent and it may well be a decisive part in affairs vital to our national welfare from which they have hitherto held aloof.

This article is devised to indicate that, according to the assertions of representatives of groups who conceive that they possess the ability to make their word law, the day of the domination of our world of industry by the capitalist employer and the manual employee has already begun to travel towards the twilight, and that in the future a powerful, if not indeed a controlling, voice in the direction thereof will be openly exercised by the hitherto "Hidden Hand"—by the men who have always been the real sum and substance, the originating, pivotal, and performing parts, the heart and soul, of our multifarious business enterprises—the men whose brains plot and pursue and perfect the projects and plans for which the capitalists find the money, and the artisan, the operative, and the labourer, under less or more supervision, bring into actual existence. In a word, in familiar phrases, the God of the Machine is going to take a share, at last and at least, in the driving of the Car of Industry.

The measure in which the great initiating, designing, organising, managing, and supervising class has so far been ignored when the claims to rule in industry have been in the throes of controversy constitutes an outstanding paradox. If the paradox had been confined to this country we might, easily comprehending, have characterised it as distinctively British; but, apparently, the facts do not admit of such a cataloguing. In any case, what is the explanation? Is it modesty, or the scornful pride of superior intellect; timidity, the fear of disturbances that might entail disaster in relation to the domestic responsibilities and professional future of ambitious and climbing men; or the fruit of reason developed by an education not enjoyed by men of the type who ordinarily go out on strike? Perchance, the secret may be in immersion in deeply interesting though fatiguing work? Surely it is not to be discovered in simple dullness or laziness! Whatever be the cause, there is also the singular fact that even the learned

men who make a study of our economic questions do not seem to have envisaged—at any rate, completely envisaged—the situation which is now in front of us.

Professor Marshall has described how “the autocratic owner and manager” of a large manufactory or what not is compelled “to delegate more and more responsibility to his chief subordinates;” how “to the managers and their assistants is left a great part of the work of engineering the business and the whole of the work of superintending it,” and how these lieutenants, upon whose “energy and probity” so “much must depend,” are “supposed to be promoted from the lower ranks to the higher according to their zeal and their ability,” and so “offered very large opportunities to men with natural talents for business management;” while “the ordinary workman, if he shows ability,” further observes our famous Cambridge authority, “generally becomes a foreman,” and may thereafter become a manager and later still a partner. But Professor Marshall’s imagination does not appear to have been equal to the conception of the prospect of to-day; any how he leaves the impression that he entertains the view that from the standpoint of the directing and over-looking lieutenants all is for the best in the best possible of worlds.

Mr. Sidney Webb, in his two-year-old, “Works Manager To-day,” though perceiving the ever-increasing importance of the profession of manager, whoever may be his governor or governors, and that round about half a dozen alternatives exist as to the future form of mastery in our industries, does not contemplate the new position of affairs. He is content to see “the professional managers of the various services eventually organising themselves into a professional association of their own, perhaps in an Institute of Managers like the Institute of Actuaries or the Institute of Architects, with its several grades of membership, concerned with the progressive development of its own technique, fostering its own special vocational training, succouring the needs of its less fortunate members, and standing up, in its own way, for the special interests of its own rank and file, and the status and dignity of the profession”—a happy, if conventional, prospect, verily. Even that “live wire” of the economic future in the United States, Walter Lippmann, merely observes in his latest volume, “Drift and Mastery” (1914), that “the Labour Movement” will “have to work out the intricate problem of popular control in relation to technical administration.”

But the prospect under discussion, as might, perhaps, have been expected, has not escaped the attention of the Syndicalists; and Mr. G. H. D. Cole is entirely frank upon the problem involved, in his “World of Labour” (1917). He writes thus (page 357): “The question at issue is not whether ‘management’ should be conducted by mob-rule, by its transference to the trade union as a whole, but whether the managers, who are also producers, should be responsible to, and elected by, the rest of the producers in the particular industry or by an external authority representing the consumer. Clearly, if the consumer elect, the managerial staff will remain independent of the workers, who will be organised over against

them as a trade union ; if the producers elect, the managerial staff will be absorbed into the union, which will take on, to some extent, a hierarchical form. The right to elect the rulers is a recognised principle of democratic political theory. Is there any reason why such a principle should not be applied to industry also? Indeed, is 'industrial democracy' possible unless it is so applied? If democracy can be applied to the workshop, the workers must elect and control their managers, in so far as those managers are concerned with the processes, and not with the what, when, and how much of production." Though this pronouncement does not lend any handle to misconception, there is room for a considerable degree of doubt whether the declaration embodies a working feasibility.

The new organisation, there is reason to believe, does not ignore the possibility that a triumphant Syndicalism, while dethroning Capitalism, might delegate to its members the responsibilities of management in various directions. The question, however, is this: If this should be so, would the elected officers carry an authority sufficient to enable them to pursue their tasks successfully? If an illustration dating from Russia shortly before the outbreak of the war, cited by a Russian friend, may be accepted (as may be questioned) as a good guide, they would not. A prolonged industrial dispute in the Caucasus had produced a situation in which the directors of a company had transferred the works to the control of the workpeople in the capacity of owners, who, in turn, had entrusted the command to the managers under the original directors. When, however, the old-new managers proceeded to exercise their authority, they met with obstacles that compelled them to abandon their posts. Feeling the pressure of discipline, certain of the workmen did not hesitate to notify the officers put over them, in language at once egotistic and emphatic, that the owners of the works declined to be ordered about by their servants, with the consequence that the managers retired and the original directors resumed control, with ownership. Doubtless, the British workman is keener in intellect and fairer in attitude than his Russian brother; but who can deny that under provocation he is capable of mighty demonstrations in the sphere of stubbornness? We cannot forget what the "Journeyman Engineer" of half a century ago, Thomas Wright, advised us, that many industrial projects, finally successful, would have been "emphatically vetoed" by the working men who ultimately benefited from them as "mad schemes." Yet, with our knowledge of the campaign of education pursued in the interval, we are confident that the intelligence, knowledge, and reason of our artisans and operatives would, if put to the same test, give a largely different result to-day.

Anyhow, whether the intervention of the Unions of the Brain-Workers comes as a surprise or not, we have all, whatever our rôle, to face the fact of their advent.

This advent, it may be historically interesting to record, is officially marked by the request of the General Secretary of the Society of Technical Engineers, Mr. Norman Wyld, at the beginning of April, that the brain-workers' unions should be

granted representation in the National Industrial Council. The representation sought has so far not been conceded. It can be easily understood that it is difficult to determine how these bodies of brain-workers, the heads and hands and feet of the employing class, are to be classified in a National Industrial Council. But concerning its ultimate grant there can be no manner of doubt, though, conceivably, not in a degree with which the new, or rather the emerging, factor will be satisfied.

It is fitting at this stage that we should indicate roughly the types of employees who are thus seeking to make themselves felt, not more effectively in the world of industrial administration, which is almost impossible, but more authoritatively and forcibly in the absolute government of industry. The movement is initially and powerfully embodied in the Society of Technical Engineers (whose offices, by the way, are at 25, Victoria Street, London, S.W.1), but there is in course of promotion and federation a wide range of unions representing brain as distinct from muscle workers. The Federation, as it is conceived, will, in comparatively quick time, embrace the scientific investigators and the inventors, the general devisers and special designers, the laboratory men and the examiners of goods, the work-finders, the cost-fixers, and the finance experts, the buyers of material and the sellers of goods, the labour specialists and welfare wardens, and, above all, the managers and business administrators—in short, the men who know, who counsel, who determine, who do—with the innumerable satellites of the foregoing, including the foremen, the overseers, and the superintendents. It has been computed that by the last census the number of men in these categories in the United Kingdom in the years immediately preceding the outbreak of war was roughly about half a million. Though the movement has hitherto been conducted “under the rose,” there are already a substantial body of members enrolled in the various unions, and the number will doubtless grow with the increasing advertisement their objects attain.

It is possible, of course, considering the intellectual status of the members and the attitude of independence which accrues therefrom, that the rank and file will be less amenable to the counsel of their leaders than until recently were the rank and file of the manual workers’ unions—in fact, it is arguable that the dangers of disruption are greater in the former than in the latter. But it may be urged—what, indeed, the writer easily discerned at a crowded private meeting of the Technical Engineers’ Society, which he attended by invitation as an observant outsider, at the Lincolnshire Room in Tothill Street, Westminster, some nine months ago—that though the alert, shrewd, capable men who constitute those brain-workers’ unions may ponder long before they take a definite course, they are not likely to abandon it, once it has been entered upon, without impeccable reason! However, history will say its say upon this point all in good time.

Whatever may be their co-operative future, these men, it will be well to recognise at the beginning as beyond all question, play a highly important, nay, the vital, part in the conduct of our industries. In the phrase reminiscent of our nursery days, they are “the men

who make the wheels go round," the men who have never failed to keep the machinery of our great British world of industry and commerce regularly moving, whatever the difficulties, whatever the issues. In a vast body of instances, it is being confidently affirmed by well-informed people, they are far more valuable as a national asset than their capitalist employers. An employer may possess a vast capital, and have many important threads of outside influence in his fingers, without owning the qualities essential to success in the conduct of a great industry, and the needs of policy or organisation, or the desire to capture a trade secret or a secret of nature, or the necessity of justly handling labour, may make his manager, or a subordinate of the manager, or even a subordinate of the subordinate, a more valuable personage than the proprietor of the works himself. And so, too, from the side of labour: artisans, operatives, labourers may be most efficient and zealous, but what is their value if the repositories of scientific knowledge, the imaginative or reliable designers of goods, the skilful, wide-visioned managers, be not there to find and give them their tasks and superintend these? Neither capital nor labour, in short, can afford to see the men represented by the Brain-Workers' Federation desert their posts *en masse*. Truly may the more boastful of them style themselves It. It is significant that since this article was typed, an Interview has been published in *The Daily Chronicle* in which Lenin is represented as acknowledging that the Bolshevik *régime* has had, "in a period of transition," to "signify a truce" in its "offensive against capitalism" and engage in "a retrograde movement" by "paying high salaries" in order "to secure the services of the most competent bourgeois specialists" (in another sentence described as "scientific and technical experts"). Assuredly it may be admitted in the frankest way that it is the brain-workers who, along with the million-force armies of the manual workers, can secure for us that hugely-enlarged production which is our imperative need if we are to lift ourselves out of the deep pit in which we find ourselves. Remembering how the fate of the Empire will be in solution in the workshops of Britain within the next three or five years, the attitude of these brain-workers to our economic problems, never unimportant, must surely bulk as supreme among the considerations before the nation at this hour. Happy, therefore, must we all be to learn that their motto, together with their standard of efficiency, is "More Production with Less Effort."

Their attitude to capital, so far as I have been able to discover, is, while not hostile, characterised by a note of criticism, sometimes tolerant, sometimes sharp. They feel keenly that, except in instances rare, they have never received the consideration which, in view of the sovereign nature of their contribution to the Kingdom's progress, they regard as their due. In particular, they complain, complain bitterly, that all too frequently outside influences, influences of Finance and influences of Society—spheres often represented on directorates by men with the faintest of technical qualifications—deprive them of the promotion they had a legitimate right to expect. They insist, too, that capital does not always "play the game" with them in other respects. The unions are actually the direct outcome

of the attempt of a firm to prevent a former employee from securing employment in an area far distant from the locale of the firm. Capital, they make it clear, has got to "mend its ways" in several directions if it desires to avoid the attentions of the brain-workers' unions.

Their attitude to labour, too, may be stated in similar terms, though, in all probability, with a warmer friendliness of tone. They know all too acutely that labour, as hitherto interpreted, works much less hard, and, considering their respective achievements, has been much more handsomely rewarded. For example: the newspaper reporter, in many instances, receives less than the compositor who "sets" his copy upon the linotype. The brain-worker is likewise handicapped severely, as compared with the manual worker, by the cost of his education, the impositions of his status, and the levies of the municipality and the State. But he does not complain; rather, with a tinge of bitterness, he congratulates labour upon its exploit, though he is not quite sure he shall follow in its paths. He may (indeed, I fancy he ultimately will) decide to co-operate under certain circumstances with labour; but such co-operation must be on terms which do justice to his value in the scheme of things. For instance, he is not to be fobbed off with a small proportion of either labour's or capital's representation on the acting committee of the National Industrial Council; to a proportion so ignominious, whether it be offered by the spokesmen of capital or "these tornadoes of trade unions," to employ the great Shaftesbury's phrase, that Mr. Wyld can only reply, "Thank you for nothing." And should the Syndicalists in time ask him, in the words of Walt Whitman, "Were I to you as the boss employing and paying you, would that satisfy you?" I imagine he would put in a strong claim to a powerful, if not a preponderating, share in the "bossdom."

In truth, the brain-workers' policy, as is natural, remains to be more distinctly defined. But it can be declared, declared with all emphasis, that they are resolved to play a part far more commensurate with their position as the keepers of the keys of industry. To this end, Mr. Wyld (who may be remembered as a University lecturer) is preparing to amass, as his contacts will enable him to do, an array of statistics that may exercise a profound influence in the settlement of controversies in the industrial world. Theirs, undeniably, is the revolt of the hidden hand, the revolt of the men who have hitherto carried on quietly the most vital part of the work of a tremendous industry behind the arras. Still, the unions are not out for mischief. In point of fact, their objective is National Prosperity rather than mere sectional interest. If I rightly catch the meaning of the promoters of these brain-workers' unions, this may be their *métier*. All the same, they are also determined to make themselves felt in their own interest as well as in the interest of the State. And if their wishes are not respected, if their representatives are flouted, then we may be fated to witness another Great Power on strike.

WILLIAM HILL.

LITERARY SUPPLEMENT.

LIST OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
1. THE AUDACIOUS TWINS. By J. E. G. DE M. ...	697
2. REVIEWS	702
THE OXFORD HISTORY OF INDIA; THE RISORGIMENTO; AN ENGLISH PRISON; OXFORD AFTER THE WAR; THE VENERABLE BEDE.	
3. SHORTER REVIEWS. "The State in Peace and War"; "Papers on Current Finance"; "Helps for Students of History"; "Lay Religion"	712

THE AUDACIOUS TWINS.

MR. JOHN LAWSON RIDDELL, a business man, of mature years and substantial fortune, who during the war had taken reasonable advantage of his knowledge of the Corn Market and had paid with a striking sense of citizenship a tax of magnitude on the excess profits that his abilities and the fortune of war had thrust upon him, determined that at last the time had come for a holiday. Mr. Riddell loved many things: he loved business, but was no slave to it; he loved books, but kept them in their proper place—the library—where he consorted with them at fixed hours; and he loved the country. He was of country stock, and as he was the last of his stock in the male line, he liked to revisit his native county in the hope of finding descendants of an earlier generation by whose aid he could complete the pedigree which he, a bachelor, found infinite entertainment in compiling, and for which he felt no responsibility save in his own substantial person. So, after a long talk with Mr. Adolphus Smith, a confidential head clerk of unimpeachable honesty, and to whom Mr. Riddell was an object not only of worship but respect, he departed without leaving an address on a fortnight's tour. It was an amazing fortnight for Mr. Smith as well as for Mr. Riddell. Throughout that fortnight of blazing June things happened without ceasing. The Middle Voice, to use a grammatical parallel and thus avoid theological doctrines of interposition, took control of the affairs of men.

It is sometimes good, and especially good after the strain of the Five Years' War, to put aside the urbanities and assume the ruralities of life; to revel in the sunshine and sit in the shade, to watch the buttercups and daisies, the dairymaids and shepherds, the sheep and cows, the stretches of meadowland, the goose-pastured common lands, the woodlands green and gracious; to listen to the cuckoo booming from cover to cover, to watch the lark in his heavenward light and his swift seraphic fall, to harken in the close of moon-blessed evenings to the last swift raptures of the thrush or the linnet singing in the swaying larch. Mr. Riddell, as he settled in the train and lit an ancient briar, set his mind, nay, his soul, to all these things. He was travelling entirely alone, and

an extraordinary restfulness pervaded his whole nature. He was absolutely at peace with himself. He had had an excellent lunch. He was looking forward to an excellent tea. The view from the train grew, every moment, more and more remote from men and towns. He had a little case of books with him in which to dip. He had no newspaper. Part of the holiday was to see no newspaper, receive no letters, to hear no familiar voice for a whole fortnight. He dipped in his bookcase as a child dips into a bag of sweets. Miss Rossetti suited his fancy for a moment:—

And filing peacefully between the trees,
 Having the moon behind them, and the sun
 Full in their meek mild faces, walked at ease
 A homeward flock, at peace
 With one another and with everyone.

Then Mr. Arnold called him:—

The evening comes, the fields are still,
 The tinkle of the thirsty rill,
 Unheard all day, ascends again,

 The business of the day is done.

And then an unknown poet:—

Life is a tree whose fruits assault the sky;
 Life is a stream and none who drink shall die;
 Life is a song that angels steer them by.

And last came Mr. William Wordsworth:—

A soul, by force of sorrows high,
 Uplifted to the purest sky
 Of undisturbed humanity.

It will be noticed that Mr. Riddell, by this time, as he sipped his cup of tea, supplied by a noiseless attendant, had become almost part of undisturbed humanity. He had had his sorrows, and he had frankly benefited by them. For the nonce he had slipped off the mortal coil of business, and he began to look at humanity and daily life with the detachment of a visitant from some Andromedian Universe. The common things of life seemed so strange and new. He looked back upon his life without regret and with serene curiosity, he looked forward with little anticipation and with no curiosity. Time for him, indeed, seemed to have come to a standstill, and he was beginning to wonder if immortality were like that, and whether Chaucer's poor person's foretaste were correct, when the train quietly stopped at his station, a lonely lovely wayside nook. So with his case of books, his stick and umbrella, with a mackintosh wrapped round them, and his light but roomy suitcase, he stepped out into the loveliest spot in his native county. He commended his bookcase, his suitcase, his mackintosh and umbrella to a youthful porter and bade him carry them to the Seven Stars, the reputable inn of the village, whither he himself departed along the glowing evening road with peace in his soul and a walking

stick in his hand. He was the only person to alight. The boy went off over the fields. He was alone with the birds and the bees, the dog-roses and the scents of hay, woodruff and the sweet briar. He had come to his own land. His mother was born in the manor house of the village. When a little boy he had visited the house and the inn. He remembered the inn, with its great room for village meetings and festivities and dances, a room with a minstrels' gallery, an inn five hundred years old, but younger than his stock. As he came down the road he wondered if any of the stock, a stock with beaked noses and a definite and iron personality, a self-willed, clear-thinking stock, if any of the stock survived. Presently he came out of the enchanted hedges on to the long stretch of the village green, where lights were already showing though the daylight was still abroad. Across the green he saw the Seven Stars. He saw the boy from the station come out and depart, and he saw standing on the steps that led up to the main door a figure that seemed strangely, almost terrifyingly, familiar. It grew more and more knowable as he approached. That morning, before he left home, he had glanced at himself in a long mirror and had approved of his serviceable but well-worn country suit and gaiters. The figure that he saw on the steps of the inn was the figure that he had seen in the mirror that very morning. The figure, which had evidently just received the labelled luggage, was waiting for him with plain curiosity. And as Mr. Riddell came close he saw written on the lintel of the door above the head of the figure the words, "John Riddell, licensed victualler." The two men looked at each other. They might have been twins. "Welcome, Mr. Riddell," said the innkeeper, "come in and make yourself at home." He spoke in a voice of quiet hospitable assurance that Mr. Riddell recognised as his own, the voice that he used on the Corn Market or in his home. The two men shook hands and each smiled at the other. "I believe I *have* come home," said the merchant. "I know you have," said John. "We have kept the old fires burning for you, you who have become famous while we have remained ——" "Tut, tut," said the merchant, "we'll tell each other everything after supper."

* * *

Life is a struggle between heredity and environment, and results ultimately depend on the capacity of personality to harness environment to its purpose. In the case of these two Riddells different environments had not been able to subdue dominant personalities and, strangely enough, each found, as they pored over the merchant's pedigree tables and talked of common ancestors and of one tremendous eighteenth-century woman who was the mother of the race, that each longed to do the work the other was doing. The innkeeper was also a successful farmer and longed to play a part in the central Corn Market. The merchant had a little farm of his own and longed to see what production on a larger scale really meant. In that long upper room where the family portraits hang these two men, who had never seen each other before, swore eternal friendship, as well they might, for the innkeeper's two daughters, veritable Riddells and charming withal, as they welcomed Cousin John (who insisted on being called Uncle John and kissed them

before they retired for the night), hardly knew the merchant from their father. They were privy to the mad plot that was hatched that night. Uncle John was to become for a week the innkeeper, and the innkeeper was to depart next day, preceded by a telegram to Mr. Smith, to the purlieu of Mincing Lane. Deep into the night they talked, for each needed to know much of the other's affairs, and when the innkeeper departed for London in the morning no one in the inn marked the change that had come over the Seven Stars.

The merchant of Mincing Lane had a busy morning after his twin had fled. The house would not open till half-past twelve, and he spent the forenoon in learning from his newly-acquired nieces the technique of the bar. It was a fearful moment when, in his shirt sleeves and with his old briar in his mouth, he drew the first foaming tankard for Joe Bustard, the poacher, who brought his harmless meal to the inn. "'Ee be looking main pale, Jack Riddell, this morning," said the quick-eyed breaker of the law. "I be feeling pale," said the landlord, "pale wi' anger." The poacher said nothing, and was relieved by the crowd of farm labourers who came to have their beer with the midday meal. Mr. Riddell for the first time in his life felt flurried. The calls were continuous. His arms ached, the local references were baffling, the time-worn jests were obscure, the comments on his pallor were distressing. But all the while he was learning his men, with their neck-beards, their meditative eyes, their slow critical speech, their stolid philosophy of life. The sweat poured off the merchant's forehead, but he did his work like a man and kept the counter clean and serviceable and washed glasses in a large basin with incredible expedition. At one moment he felt that he must drop, but he kept on serving out plates of bread and cheese and foaming mugs. The nieces wanted to help, but he waved them away. Gradually the dinner hour passed, the slowest hour on record. But Joe Bustard stayed on till at last he was alone with the host once more. "'Ee be not yoursel', gov-nor, to-day, 'ee be like wold Mr. Riddell who hangs in the room above." "I be thinkin', Joe, about the peace celebrations I be goin' to have." "Be 'ee, Mr. Riddell? What be 'ee goin' to have?" "I be goin' to give a party to the women and children. How long have I known you, Joe?" The poacher pricked his ears. "School together, sir, an' you've allays been hard on I." "Rightly so," said the merchant, "but there's a chance for you now. You shall be my bailiff. Be there lands for sale marching wi' mine?" "There be, master, a thousand acre farm deserted like, beggin' for buyers and covered wi' green thistles and bog-water—a fool's bargain. You know better nor I." "I bought it this morning. Can you get me by Monday five hundred hands on the land—drainers, ditchers, hedgers, ploughmen—with their tools? If you can, you are my bailiff." The poacher rose. "We be far-away cousins, Jack Riddell. I be your man. This do make amends."

The news spread like wildfire. The country town ten miles off yielded up the men who had left the land in despair. In twenty-four hours there were fifty men at work, by the Monday the full

stale, and John Riddell poured out his money on labour and machinery. The village was thronged, but John Riddell secured huts in no time, and took back half his wages in rent, bread and cheese and beer. He reckoned on a heavy outlay but sure returns. Yet he meant to make the village as well as John Riddell. He held a meeting in the great room and spoke in his shirt sleeves from the minstrel gallery. The village had no idea of their innkeeper's power of oratory. He told them of the farm and offered a share of the profit to every worker on it; he told them of the Institute he was building for the village; he told them of the great garden he was opening beside the inn where men could bring their wives and children; he told them of the instructors that he was hiring for cricket and football in the great field which he was giving for village games. "Providence," he concluded, "has given me, undeserving though I am, unexpected wealth. I was a lad of this village. It made me, help me to make it, happy." So he came down from the Minstrel Gallery, which had never heard such a song before. It was a terrific evening, and the sweat poured off the speaker's face as he re-entered the bar and drew a mug of beer for Joe Bustard, the new bailiff. John Riddell had come for a holiday, and he was having it. After closing time he walked up and down the pleasant little moonlit orchard with a niece on either arm. "What will father say?" they kept repeating. Then they added, "We are so glad; he is too stern. They will love him better now."

* * *

If John Riddell revolutionised Great Whimley in a week the other John Riddell was himself revolutionised in less time. Mr. Smith was not altogether surprised at his master's return, but was astonished at the effects of the sun on his usually pale face. Mr. Riddell was unnaturally quiet and refrained from interference with business, scarcely commenting on substantial orders. He only carried out one personal deal. On the Saturday morning he rang his bell and Mr. Smith was instantly at his side with fingers just tipped above his watch chain. "I happen to know, Mr. Smith, that it is possible to purchase the future corn harvests on the following farms and estates in my home county. I know these crops well. I wish to buy these futures. Can you arrange it? My price is——" and the farmer named what seemed a high price. The vast transaction was carried out, and as soon as it was known created fierce excitement. John Riddell had boldly carried prices to an unprecedented point: would the market repudiate him or follow? His reputation for extraordinary caution settled the question; a boom in prices and his profits were assured. Sir James Longbottom, the Corn King, called on him merely to congratulate him on the crowning stroke of a great career. "I never realised that you could do anything so great." "The best corn in Europe, Sir James, and we are nearer the centres of starvation than America by seven days." "Well, well," said the great man, "you did what I was afraid to do." Mr. Riddell had become in four days much paler, and a letter he received on the same day made the pallor permanent. The Crown, recognising his abundant charities, his war service, his great position in trade, offered him a baronetcy

The bearer of the letter needed an answer forthwith. He decided to accept. He had made enough that day to support the title. He began to doubt whether he would go back at all to Great Whimley. In any event he took the chair that night at the annual dinner of the Society for the Support of Decayed Farmers, and made the one speech of his brief public career. He said, "The decayed farmer, like the decayed clergyman, is always with us. The war has made many farmers, and therefore many clergymen, rich. Let the rich give to those who are decayed beyond the rebound of prosperity. I propose to head the list with £10,000." As he spoke his face glowed with genial benevolence. Next day he returned to the Seven Stars.

* * *

The twins, as agreed, had indeed acted freely with each other's money. They had each spent a week of devastating delight. An orgy of unfamiliar labours had been crowned, in each case, with almost preposterous success. The huge profits of the innkeeper's great stroke paid for all, while the stroke itself beyond all doubt secured the baronetcy. On the other hand, the moral profits of the merchant's great farming venture promised to transform the farming system of England. When the two men exchanged notes each became amazed at his own success. It was as if miracles had been happening in those golden days of June: so they said to one another as they walked in the cool of the evening, in the inn garden under the golden moon, with bird voices still around them. Joe, the Esau of the race, was serving in the bar, lord of the village folk. "We must all meet again at Christmas," said Sir John, kissing both his nieces.

J. E. G. DE M.

REVIEWS.

THE OXFORD HISTORY OF INDIA.*

Dr. Vincent Smith's history of India should find a place in all libraries, public and private. There is nothing of quite the same range or character, and it has the substantial advantage, which so much modern composite history lacks, of the stamp of one mind, of a mind that is singularly cautious in the reception of evidence, fully familiar with the latest research, steeped in special knowledge as to the unfamiliar Hindu period, and entirely generous to workers of the same generation. Moreover, Dr. Vincent's history bears his own philosophy of history. He is not satisfied to write a history of India because it has the geographical appearance of separateness. He felt that such a history would have no peculiar significance unless he was clear in his own mind that there is something essentially unitary about this peninsula or sub-continent. He

* *The Oxford History of India from the Earliest Times to the end of 1911.* By Vincent A. Smith, C.I.E., Oxford. (At the Clarendon Press. 12s. 6d. net.)

finds that unitary character in the essential yearning of Indians of all castes, faiths, and races, for a unity; a yearning or faith which was partially satisfied by Mohammed bin Taghlah in the fourteenth century, by the Great Mogul in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and almost fully satisfied by the British Raj in the nineteenth. "The political unity of all India, although never attained perfectly in fact, always was the ideal of the people throughout the centuries. . . . The immemorial persistence of that ideal goes a long way to explain the acquiescence of India in British rule, and was at the bottom of the passionate outburst of loyal devotion to their King-Emperor so touchingly expressed in many ways by princes and people in 1911." This loyalty was expressed in action during the Great War, and it may be said that the nationalist passion of many Indians to-day is recognition of the fact that English rule has taught the people to feel after a complete realisation of their essential unitary idealism. No doubt this idealism has been deepened by what Dr. Vincent Smith calls the "fundamental unity of Hinduism," but it is true that "India, beyond all doubt, possesses a deep, under-lying fundamental unity, far more profound than that produced either by geographical isolation or by political superiority. That unity transcends the innumerable diversities of blood, colour, language, dress, manners, and sect." It is almost inexplicable that this should be the case, but it is perhaps even more wonderful that this phenomenon should be observed in such vast regions as the empires of Russia and of China. There is a hiving sense on a vast scale in the human race that dominates not only conflicting races and religions but even fundamental institutions related to family life.

But we venture to think that this almost spiritual sense of unity dominating vast areas of the earth's surface is fundamentally due to some common conception of law. Dr. Vincent Smith, who is at times almost iconoclastic in his search after history, declares that "much sentimental nonsense with little relation to the actual facts has been written about the supposed indestructible constitution of the Indo-Aryan village in the north." We think that this eminent author is wrong in writing in this fashion. We believe that this ancient institution is the true link between not only various parts of India but between India and Europe. Dr. Vincent Smith prefers to turn to the "old indigenous modes of administration in the South" of India. But the records there takes us back only a little way. We are told that those institutions, like the tribal institutions of the North perished long ago. But is that true of the North where institutions far older than the Indo-Aryan village, institutions of the Matriarchal age, still survive? However, it would be fruitless to do more than indicate the view that the essential unity of India lies hidden in the village institutions of pre-history.

In a necessarily brief notice of a remarkable book it is only possible to draw attention to one or two points of large interest. One field of research is the pushing back of actual dates in the early history. It is possible to reason back for Northern India to about the year 630 B.C., but the earliest recorded date is the invasion by Alexander in 323 B.C. It is interesting to note that

this is about the date that English students of pre-history in Britain have some hope of reaching. In Greece, as is pointed out by Dr. Vincent Smith, 648 B.C. is the earliest exact date reached. In India, for the period from 650 B.C. to the time of Alexander, we have to depend mostly upon tradition, though there is some valuable foreign evidence. This class of evidence is also useful in the post-Alexander period. Thus "formal Chinese histories from about 120 B.C. have something to tell us, but by far the most important and interesting of all the foreign witnesses are the numerous Chinese pilgrims who visited the Holy Land of Buddhism between A.D. 400 and 700." That material is full of vivid detail. It is, of course, the Hindu period which is the most difficult to reconstruct "by combining fragments of information laboriously collected from inscriptions, coins, traditions, and passing literary references." Perhaps one day India will reveal her past as Crete has revealed the amazing earliest days of Greece and the Mediterranean. Dr. Vincent Smith tells us that "the peninsula was not affected at all by the Indo-Aryan movements. The people there went on their way and developed a distinct Dravidian form of civilisation. The later conversion of Southern India to Hinduism was the result of "peaceful penetration" by missionaries or small colonies, and was not a consequence of the southward march of Indo-Aryan tribes. The amount of Aryan blood in the people to the South of the Narbadá is extremely small, in fact, negligible." This is no doubt difficult to contradict; but is it possible to affirm it with quite the note of certainty that Dr. Vincent Smith adopts? Is it clear that there is no common source to the institutions of the South and the North? The presumption that Northern conquerors would penetrate far south seems so strong as to require very specific evidence of rebuttal.

Another very interesting subject is the extent of Greek influence in India. The traces of Greek rule on the North-west frontier are "surprisingly scanty. No inscription in the Greek language or script has yet (1917) been found, and the Greek names occurring in inscriptions are few, perhaps half a dozen." Dr. Vincent Smith considers that "the Greek or Hellenistic influence upon India was slight and superficial, much less in amount than I believed it to be when the subject first attracted me thirty years ago." The school of Græco-Buddhist sculpture in the Gundharà frontier province "permanently determined the type of Chinese and Japanese Buddhist images." There is a Greek element in the sculpture of the age of Asoka. The Greek language never obtained currency. Dr. Vincent Smith does not tell us if Greek influence affected village or town institutions. In Britain Roman influence and the Roman tongue vanished, but we find to-day that Roman institutions survived.

It is not possible to attempt to summarise or do more than praise this excellent and learned book which brings down into our own day the immemorial record of India. We commend it to students with the remark that there never was a time when this fascinating field of history so fully deserved or demanded the attention of the student and the statesman as it does to-day.

THE RISORGIMENTO.*

This book is published at exactly the right moment. Those who are tempted to think that Italy is asking too much at the present time should be in a position to realise how the kingdom of Italy was made, what fearful struggles for freedom she endured, and how, up to the hour in which she joined the Allies, she was, in effect, still subject to the threats of the Hapsburg. This war is her final war of freedom; it records the last achievement of the *Risorgimento*, and if Italy is to be as free to develop as England has been in the past she must have frontiers that render her immune from the threats of neighbours and the physical or economic revenge of a reorganised Germany or Austria. Other nations who have lived, on the whole, unthreatened lives do not realise the character of the supreme effort that enabled Italy to become something more than a geographical expression, do not appreciate the continual threat under which the kingdom of Italy has lived since it saved itself alive from the iniquities of the Hapsburgs, the Bourbons, and the Vatican. All have realised what France has suffered, few appreciate all that Italy has undergone. It was idealism that brought Italy into the great war. All her materialists were in favour either of siding with Austria and Germany, or of standing neutral. But she came in that she might be henceforth free, free to develop without the shadow of Central Europe brooding over her. This book will make clear to our day the conditions from which Italy has saved herself by coming in on the side of freedom.

Lord Bryce, in his preface, tells us that "the authoress of this book observes with truth that the lives and characters of the great men who accomplished the delivery of Italy from those who oppressed it a century ago, the Hapsburgs of Austria in the North, the Bourbons of Naples in the South, the Papal Government and some petty princes in the central parts of the Peninsula, are too little known in France. This is true as respects England and America also. Among us in the great free English-speaking countries there is less knowledge than there ought to be of these glorious champions of Liberty and Nationality." Those men were idealists. Signorina Pons shows us the desperate condition of Italy in the period of darkness succeeding the Congress of Vienna. It was hardly possible to imagine that the Holy Alliance could have produced such a reaction from the Napoleonic age. Francis II. of Austria stamped the new period with his "ferocious egotism and his savage absolutist ideas. The police were the link between the Emperor and his people; catholicism his strongest support . . . the cohesion of the five kingdoms of which the Empire consisted—Bohemia, Hungary, Galicia, Illyria, and Lombard-Venetia—lay in the stirring-up of those peoples' hatreds" against one another. Divide and conquer. To-day the final division has come, and that division has been the fresh fruits of the policy of Francis II. (who died in 1835), of his son, Ferdinand IV. (who abdicated in 1848 in

* *The Holocaust: Italy's Struggle with the Hapsburg*. By A. A. Pons. Translated by P. R. Lloyd, M.A. Oxon. (John Murray. 7s. 6d. net.)

favour of Francis Joseph, his nephew, dead in the heat of this last war of freedom. Francis Joseph carried far into the twentieth century all that was most evil in the policy that had tried to destroy the spiritual life of Italy. "Thinking is forbidden" was the policy of Francis Joseph and his Vatican. But it was thinking that made Italy free. The human mind cannot be controlled by the stake or the hangman.

What the authoress of this book calls "the spark under the ashes" was the answer to Austria and the Vatican. Italian thinkers made the study of history and of literature the vehicle of the *Risorgimento*. The nation began to bathe in the wonderful waters of historic memory, and the police could not stop the cleansing, life-giving process. We are shown the forerunners of active revolt—men like Vittorio Almeri, Alessandro Manzoni, Mazzini, Manin, Silvio Pellico, Massimo d'Azeglio, who became Victor Emmanuel's first Prime Minister and paved the way for Cavour a man scarcely less great than Napoleon. These writers of the *Risorgimento* were first of all patriots. They were poets and historians because they were patriots, and from Florence, Paris, London the true notes of freedom freely flowed. D'Azeglio writes: "I was never enamoured of literature. One day I took the pen in hand feeling that I could not any longer wield the sword, and I only wrote to spur my country to action." We are told, with truth, that "the despots' hate harassed them at every turn"; Silvio Pellico, Luigi Settembrini, Domenico Guerrazzi knew dungeons only too well and dungeon chains; Foscolo, Confalonieri, Manin, Gioberti died in exile as Dante had died. But they achieved their purpose. Their books were printed abroad or in Italian cellars, and were passed from hand to hand. In the teeth of a despotism far worse than anything that the Middle Ages had known these writers not only undermined the thrones of the despots and the Vatican, but organised the passion for freedom and the conception of the unity of all Italy. Turin, where the one noble ruler, Charles Albert, reigned, was the centre of new life, and in 1848 the first Liberal Constitution of Piedmont became possible and revolt also became possible. What did it matter that it failed at Novara? The very failure was success, for the world knew that Italian nationality was alive. In 1852 D'Azeglio nobly stepped aside to make room for Cavour, and the end was no longer in doubt. One of the great men of the world had come to cure a nation's woe.

All that Italy and the Italians suffered in those days can be read in this eloquent and well-translated book, and we hope that the record will be closely studied in this country. The suffering was accompanied by the efforts of Piedmont and the thinkers and the workers at Turin, Victor Emanuel, Pallavicino, and Cavour: "In 1858 and 1859 Piedmont was one vast barracks and arsenal combined, where for freedom's cause men and weapons were alike turned out." The exiles flooded the foreign Press of England, France, and America with the new idealism of Italy. The Allies of to-day were solid for Italy. Garibaldi came to Turin at the call of Cavour and Pallavicino; volunteers swarmed in from Lombardy, Venetia, Romagna, Tuscany, and at last Italy was free, the

Austrians smitten by the Franco-Italian Army at Magenta and Solferino and many another stricken field, the Papal and Bourbon troops destroyed by the unaided Italians, while Garibaldi in Sicily and Victor Emanuel in Central Italy performed miracles. Such a story is essentially epic, but here we read, perhaps, more of the tears of things than of the victories, more of the agonies than of the triumphs. It is those agonies triumphantly endured that make Italy to-day determined finally to be free.

J. E. G. DE M.

* * *

AN ENGLISH PRISON.*

In noticing this pathetic and admirably tempered book, we do not propose to enter into the question of the Conscientious Objector as such. The subject is one of great difficulty, and capable of perfectly honest statements from both sides, and we do not feel called upon to decide between the conscience which says that it is never right to fight however good the cause, and the conscience which says that force is rightly used for the destruction of evil. Mr. Hobhouse, in this book, intends

“to give the reader a record of the writer’s impressions of our prison system, and, in particular, of its moral and mental effect upon convicted prisoners. It is based upon twelve months’ experience of prison life, of which four months were spent in a large London prison and nearly eight months in a smaller county gaol. My offence happened to be that of ‘disobedience’ to military orders on the ground of conscientious objection to all war; but I do not wish to lay any stress on the nature of the offence, or on the justice of the two successive sentences imposed, except in so far as these considerations gave us a different outlook from the ordinary ‘criminals’ occupying the adjoining cells. We, objectors to conscription, were not conscious of any guilt involved in the act for which we were committed to gaol; on the contrary, we were, more or less powerfully, sustained in our endurance by a faith in the righteousness, and in many cases, in the supremely Christian character of the cause for which we conceived ourselves to be suffering loss of liberty and a measure of persecution. Rightly or wrongly, this was our conviction, and it reacted, of course, upon our impressions of prison, and differentiated them in some important respects from those of a hardened or a penitent ‘offender.’ But the main tendencies of the system, its general effects on character and mentality, seemed to me to be sufficiently clear, and to be of a similar nature for all prisoners involved.”

Mr. Hobhouse (like others of his class) underwent “hard labour” in the third division. After a year prisoners of this class are allowed to have books sent in, and have daily two periods of exercise at which walking in pairs is allowed. The sentence begins with a month of strict confinement to the cell (apart from exercise and chapel), accompanied by a fortnight’s plank bed and other disabilities. After this month good conduct secures the privilege of “associated”

* *An English Prison from Within*. By Stephen Hobhouse. With a Preface by Professor Gilbert Murray. (George Allen & Unwin Ltd. 1s. net.)

but silent labour during part of the day. There are in this type of punishment no luxuries or comfort. Only the most elementary needs of food, clothing, housing, and cleanliness are met. The prisoner has one weekly bath, and clean socks and towel once a week but wears the same underclothing day and night for a fortnight. He has to clean out his cell and utensils daily. There are three or four "chapels" a week, occasional visits from the chaplain, and some special provision for the religious needs of those who are not members of the Church of England. Personal property is reduced to a minimum. Mr. Hobhouse possessed his spectacles, his wife's letters, four small photographs, and two religious books. He had also on loan "a Greek Testament and other good books from the prison library." These library and educational books can be changed weekly. Writing, except on a slate, is not allowed. But there is the chance of becoming library assistant or "a cleaner." There is a monthly visit from the outside world, and the monthly letters in and out. Prison rations were curtailed in consequence of the war after April, 1917. Rations were curtailed, indeed, everywhere during this period, and though Mr. Hobhouse says that "there is good evidence to show that many men are suffering seriously from underfeeding" we do not understand him to suggest that in normal times food in prison is inadequate in quantity or bad in quality. The whole nation suffered seriously from underfeeding from April, 1917, onwards. Communication between prisoners when they meet moving about "to and from the chapel or workshop or exercise ring," or under any circumstances, is strictly forbidden. The men only have numbers. They are closely watched. In the door of each cell there is a glass window through which the prisoner can be inspected at any hour. In fact, the prisoners do talk to each other. The capacity to do this is an art which Mr. Hobhouse was about to accomplish when he realised that it was a deception involving continual untruthfulness, and announced his intention of speaking openly. This could not be tolerated, and for the last four months Mr. Hobhouse was shut off from associated labour.

The story is a depressing one. It might have been thought that conditions (despite much hard prison work as mat making or sewing), which are certainly better than those voluntarily assumed by many orders of monks in many ages, would have been tolerable to a man of large education with no sense of guilt. It would almost seem that the absence of the sense of responsibility, coupled with the many opportunities for quiet thought might have been turned to account by such a man as Mr. Stephen Hobhouse. But, in fact, it was not so. The prisoner felt more and more the miseries of his position until at last he lost his health and was released.

"The characteristics of the system, as impressed upon me by many dreary weeks of experience, seemed to group themselves around three main heads, which I propose to illustrate successively. First, discomfort for the body and starvation for the soul; second, the attempt to crush out the sense of individuality and the instinct to save others; and lastly, entire absence of trust, and government by fear. These characteristics are dominant enough

to give the impression that they represent the guiding objects of the system ; and they seem to stamp it as essentially deterrent and punitive, without the reformative elements that one would hope to find there."

Without holding any brief for our prison system it is difficult to admit on the evidence set forth by Mr. Hobhouse that this is really true. There is the absence of physical freedom, which is a condition precedent of this class of punishment, and there is an absence of material comforts. But there are considerable opportunities for reading and thinking, with a not illiberal supply of books, and we cannot see that any case is made out for the charge of "discomfort for the body and starvation for the soul." That prison life is a hard life no one doubts. Certainly there is "the pervading atmosphere of hostility and degradation" remarked upon by Professor Gilbert Murray. But the normal prisoner is not in prison on conscientious grounds. He is there because he is a danger to society. It may be that society has made him a danger in some or many cases, and we need to reform society and thus reduce the number of dangerous criminals. To what extent the reformation of the dangerous adult prisoner is possible it is difficult to say. It may be that the introduction of amenities into prison, and the power and opportunity of intercourse (for instance, the introduction of open debating societies, the liberty to see newspapers), might do something. But the fact remains that these men are in prison in most cases because they have done for their own purposes what they need not have done. They are in prison because they committed crimes which they knew were wrong. To make prison a comfortable moral hospital is not desirable; not desirable, that is to say, if the theory that punishment is justifiable survives. In any event, certain criminals must be restrained; society cannot be left at the mercy of men who are often moral monsters. Cure the moral disease if it is possible, but presumably this would involve far longer terms of imprisonment than are now usual.

It is strange to compare Mr. Hobhouse's experiences with those of the British Prisoners of War who fell into the hands of Germans, Bulgarians, or Turks. They were often starved, thrashed, overworked, and tortured; they lived in filthy verminous places. There was no term to their imprisonment, no mercy in their gaolers. They had, no doubt, to some extent the power of personal intercourse, but nevertheless they have returned in many cases wrecked in body and mind to their homes. They suffered for their nation, and it was because of their suffering and of the suffering of their fellows in the trenches that we to-day are a free nation in possession of our lives and fortunes. The Conscientious Objector, when he thinks of this, will forget his own small troubles in their martyrdom.

* * *

OXFORD AFTER THE WAR.*

Professor J. A. Stewart, in this monograph, has given us one of the most fruitful essays on the significance of University education

* *Oxford after the War and a Liberal Education*. By J. A. Stewart, White's Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Oxford. (B. H. Blackwell, Oxford. 1s. 6d. net.)

that has been published of recent years. Reformers at Oxford "must first of all realise clearly what was the essential characteristic of the life of Oxford throughout the stages of her development in the past." The great difference created by the war must be used, as an opportunity of maintaining the traditional Oxford life "in fresh vigour and with enhanced value." Secondly, in the New Age:—

"Oxford, if she is true to herself, will have it in her power to advance to a position of great influence as a centre to which students from the over-sea nations of the British Commonwealth, and, indeed, from the whole English-speaking world, will be more and more attracted."

It has always been the business of Oxford to make "the imparting of a liberal education her principal concern." To-day "she must reform her scheme of liberal education in the sense of assigning a place in it to National Science by the side of Humane Letters themselves more broadly conceived." Liberal education means that the student must be an amateur, that is a lover of wisdom for its own sake. He is not to be a specialist even though he is preparing to be a specialist, but he is to be a serious student, not thinking whether this or that subject is going to pay, but laying the deep basis of what we may call the humane understanding. He is to be an amateur in the nobler sense in science as in humane letters, and the study of both must be part of the whole course. If science is the student's main subject and letters the "side" subject, he must make letters part of his course from first to last; but Professor Stewart feels that real knowledge of the "side" subject should not be tested by examination but should be so communicated by inspired teachers as to become part of the personality of the student. The science student must take as his "side" subject the branch of humane letters most nearly allied to the science and it must be so taught that "it may well turn out to be the most influential in Oxford, and to be that which demanded the services of the best teachers and secured the willing attendance of the best students."

The same principle is also true where humane letters are the main subject, and it should be also true in the case of the non-honours man. In all cases the student should leave Oxford with a really liberal training in the best thought, both in arts and science.

But Professor Stewart is particularly anxious that the principle underlying the present school of *Literæ Humaniores* should be extended from Greek and Latin to modern languages. He would have such a school for all great languages, especially an English School of *Literæ Humaniores*, a school that would attract men from all over the English-speaking world and include all humane aspects of prose and thought contained in the works of our great English philosophers. This seems to us a noble conception, and one that is likely to prove a spiritual bond of Empire. But the proposal to extend the idea of such a school to other languages seems to us to be even more important, for the idea more truly perhaps than any other idea would form a spiritual basis for a true League of Nations. If brought fully into operation we should have many trained men and women fully conversant with the language,

literature, and philosophy of the great European nations. Such an achievement would mean a new understanding between nations, an understanding which would be the best guarantee of peace and good will and joint work for the betterment of a distressed and unhappy world. All that Professor Stewart demands for Oxford should also be demanded for Cambridge. Cambridge, indeed, in some ways is farther along the road, and to-day, if she would but set her mind and soul to the task and repudiate the dangerous suggestion of State help, should, equally with Oxford, play her part in making a new age worthy of man's infinite potentialities.

* * *

THE VENERABLE BEDE.*

The historical *effigies* of Bede (673-735) seems far away. He was born in the neighbourhood of Yarrow nearly twelve hundred and fifty years ago. We know nothing of his kith and kin, save that he was a Northumbrian. Born on the Abbey lands of the Monastery of St. Peter and St. Paul at Wearmouth and Yarrow, at the age of seven years he was given to the Monastery, into the care of the Abbot Benedict, and there he was educated, and well educated. There he lived for four and fifty years, and he became, as was common for seven centuries after with men of great intellectual power, the historian and scholar of the House. He "took sweet pleasure in always learning, teaching, or writing." He was a pupil of the great John of Beverley himself, a pupil of Archbishop Theodore, who introduced Greek learning into England. He became a notable character and played his part in the daily economic life of the Monastery. He travelled little. He almost certainly never left England, but he visited York and Lindisfarne and other places within reasonable reach. He wrote incessantly on the Scriptures, the life of Bishop Cuthbert in verse and prose, the life of Abbots of his house whom he had known, much verse, much general prose on the nature of Things and on Times, a school book on orthography, and other treatises, and his ever famous work, "The Ecclesiastical History of Our Island and Race," in five books. He was a man of immense literary gifts, of perfect balance of mind and soul, of great confidence in himself and in the faith which was his life. He seems not to have been the only member of his family in the Monastery, for he mentions "Major Beda, presbyter," whom we may perhaps assume to have been his brother. We have a detailed record of his death, but his quiet laborious life had no history. He did his duty day by day and became immortal, venerable indeed because beyond the assaults of time.

Dr. Browne has done well in producing this popular though learned account of the life and writings of this great man. Bede stands out as a type of the best English character; his life is a

* *The Venerable Bede: His Life and Writings.* By the Right Rev. F. G. Browne, D.D., formerly Bishop of Stepney, and of Bath. Vice-president of the Society of Antiquaries. Illustrated. (S.P.C.K. 10s. net.)

study of unassuming effort which is full of lessons for an age that needs men and scholars of this school. Far away as Bede is, unfamiliar as are his features and his age, we recognise in him a permanent type of the race, an exemplar to every age when restlessness and hunger for loud-sounding achievement tend to divert the deeper thinking of men. Dr. Browne carries us along the narrative that Bede gives us. We see the Conversion of Northumbria, the apostasy of her kings, the restoration of Northumbrian Christianity at the hands of Scottish Christians, the death of Aidan in 643, the growth of Christianity at the hands of the Scottish bishops up to the coming of Theodore to Canterbury. Dr. Browne then turns back and shows us the earliest days of Christianity in Britain, does not destroy the hope that Paul himself visited us, pictures the coming of Augustine and the difficulties of the relations between the Churches of North and South. Next we are taken to the text of the Ecclesiastical History and are shown Bede's passion for true history, the fact that determined King Alfred to secure an English version of the work. Bede strove hard to secure the best sources for his work and from that work comes, speaking generally, all that we know of the Christianizing of the Jutes, and the Angles and the Saxons, though Bede's contemporaries, Stephen Eddi and Adamnan, to some extent supplement his work. Bede gives us a summary of British history from the days of Cæsar to those of Augustine, and it may be doubted if the full significance of Bede's text has yet been fully worked out, especially in his relations to the history of Education. Britain, he says, was formerly richer in great towns. Evidence now accumulating seems to show a very prosperous Britain before the days of the Romans, and Bede's evidence may yet be of decisive value on this point. Students of general and English ecclesiastical history will turn once again with profit to these pleasing pages, to the lives of the abbots, to Bede's poems, to his scientific work, to his commentaries, homilies and sermons, to the general account of his age. Some may like to supplement Dr. Browne's chapter on Anglo-Saxon Art with the pages in Dr. Rice Holmes' volume on Ancient Britain. The age was great in art as well as in promise. Unless we understand the ages of Bede and of Alcuin we cannot truly appreciate later times. This is the real value of Dr. Browne's competent volume which we have not here attempted to criticize in detail but certainly are anxious to commend to school specialists in history.

SHORTER REVIEWS.

Professor John Watson, of Queen's University, Kingston, Canada, in "The State in Peace and War" (James Maclehose & Sons, 7s. 6d. net), purports to follow "the evolution of political ideas from the origin of the City-State to the rise of the modern Nation-State," and gives "what seems to me the true principle of the latter." Professor Watson's general outlook may be gathered from the statement in the preface that "the development of political theory from the fundamental

idea of Plato and Aristotle that the State exists for the production of the best life, through the long and troubled period of the Roman Empire and the Middle Ages, is a continuous development, in which one element after another obtains prominence until we reach the period of the modern Nation-State, in which the ideas of check and balance, of a law of nature, of absolute sovereignty, of contract and utility, form stepping-stones to the clear and simple conception of the State as existing for the establishment of the external conditions under which the highest human life may be carried on." It is a little difficult to see that the changes in form have been "a continuous development." We move from the tiny City-State, with its slave basis, at a bound to World-States. In the break-up of these we come to something like "Nationality-States," and these latter states tend to grow larger and larger, with many races assuming at any rate the privileges of some dominant nationality. At the moment there seems a tendency towards a division of the world between Latin and British nationalities. At the moment, those States, after a great war, are assuming a static condition. There seems little of the nature of development in all this: epochs divided by cataclysms almost immeasurable in form and length of operation seem nearer the truth. There is one evolutionary note, but Professor Watson hardly touches it. The State has progressed from a slave-basis to a free basis, and the free basis is only finally being secured at this moment with the political emancipation of women. Nor does there seem to be anything like a direct line of development in theory; theory has followed events, idealising them in almost slavish fashion. Aristotle, as Professor Watson points out, leaps ahead (from our modern point of view) of Plato, whose Communism is frankly based on slavery. Aristotle stands for the family and private life, as we do. In fact, Plato and Aristotle are merely idealising particular features of the life in which they lived. Professor Watson hardly makes the necessary point that the Roman Empire, by tolerating, and indeed encouraging the essential characteristics of local provincial life, made modern nations possible. We are told that under the Empire "anything like independent nationality disappeared." But did it in fact exist before the Empire? Did not the Empire make nationality, as we understand it, possible? The Romans were much greater statesmen than the Greeks. Dante, who made Italy, the Italy which is laid up in heaven, fully realised that she is the child of Rome. And so are we all, we modern nations. Greece has little part in our heredity. When once the modern idea of a State was born, then thinkers arose with theories of defence, theories of politics, theories of international relations, theories of the relation of the individual to the State and of the State to the individual. So Machiavelli, Bodin, Grotius, Spinoza, Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, Hegel, Kant come upon the scene. These gave us the respective ideals of the State and its relation to man, represented by the British and the German Empires. In the latter, the State is a thing in itself, for which all the subjects exist. In the former the State is something which merely exists to supplement the imperfect capacity of the individuals who make up the State. Now, this hardly seems to meet the idea of "continuous development." The German State is a distorted magnification of a Greek City-State, and, like it, is based on the slavery of the individual. The British Empire is an aggregate of States which, as Professor Watson very truly says, "may take any form which is consistent with its central principle of democratic self-government." This has nothing in common with Greece, though it owes much to Rome.

At a time when we realise to the full that we owe our existence as a nation to the sea-power of our gallant navy in war, it is pleasant to have brought to our attention how ships, sailors, and the sea have conduced to the spreading of the Gospel of Peace. ("The Ships of Peace," Oxford University Press, 2s. 6d. net). This little volume by Mr. Basil Mathews, beautifully printed in compact form, with charming illustrations from old prints and photographs, tells the story of some of the journeys of missionary vessels, and makes delightful perusal. The style is so lucid and simple, yet direct, that it reads almost like an ancient chronicle. The following passage is a good example: "At that place under the palm trees of Tahiti, with the beating of the surf on the shores before them and the great mountain forests behind, these brown islanders of the South Seas gave a part of their land to Captain Wilson and their men that they might live there." Just in one or two places the story would perhaps have been improved and made clear with a little more descriptive matter. For example, on p. 24 we find John Williams on the ship, and then suddenly on land, with no link of explanation; or on p. 34, one would have liked a few lines to show how it was that the missionary met the king and people, and what appearance they had, and not merely to have their dialogue suddenly introduced. However, this is, especially in a work purporting to deal with facts, a failing in the right direction, and many of the incidents recorded are so thrilling that the relation of the actual events is sufficient to create an impression. Such is the account of the typhoon and the lifting of the "Messenger of Peace" bodily on to the shore—a truly marvellous preservation—or of the escape of the motor-boat from the canoes. The work is brought quite up to modern times, and contains a list, at the end, of the principal ships of the London Missionary Society, and a summary of their exploits. One of them, a steel boat, the "Morning Star," was abandoned early in the war on the shore of Lake Tanganyika, to which it had been brought overland, and the hull was carefully holed by the Germans who discovered it, lest it should be used again. It is such little incidents as these that give an air of crisp actuality to the whole volume.

* * *

Sir Adolphus Ward carries his fourscore years lightly, and his latest work reveals no trace of failing powers. To the excellent new series, "Helps for Students of History," edited by Mr. C. Johnson and Professor Whitney (Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge), the veteran scholar has contributed two volumes—the larger entitled "The Period of Congresses," the smaller "Securities of Peace." At the present moment when all eyes are turned to Paris, a survey of the Congress of Vienna, and of the meetings which prepared it and grew out of it, is peculiarly welcome. Sir Adolphus has written on the subject elsewhere, but many readers will be grateful for the simple narrative and the modest dimensions of his new record. With his invariable fairness he describes the difficulties which beset the diplomats who met to remake the map of Europe, and, like Mr. Webster in his recent monograph on the Congress, he claims that their work was sounder and less open to censure than has been generally recognised. The story is continued throughout the following decade, and the Holy Alliance is accompanied to its grave. The second volume, "Securities of Peace," forms a continuation of the theme of the first, and deals with the chief treaties of the nineteenth century, the Hague Conferences, attempts at mediation, arbitration treaties and awards, the limitation of armaments, and cognate subjects. The volume concludes with a brief sketch of the attempts to

prevent the outbreak of the war of 1914, and with a survey of the schemes, both old and new, for a League of Nations, in which the author rightly discerns the supreme security for Peace. It is always a pleasure to read the writings of the Master of Peterhouse, who combines knowledge and judgment in a degree unequalled by any living British historian, and whose loving absorption in the study of the past has in no way blunted his interest in the living problems of the present, or diminished his capacity to guide, encourage and warn his fellow-citizens.

* * *

In "Lay Religion" (Headley Bros., price 3s. 6d.) Mr. Henry T. Hodgkin seems to us to have written two very beautiful and profound chapters at the end, entitled "Demand for a Knowledge of God," and "The Life that is Life Indeed," in which he expresses the essence of religious belief, the true holding of which, as pointed out by the writer, transforms life. But in the previous chapter of the volume, and in the last page of the latter chapter just referred to, where Mr. Hodgkin tries to show the working out of the practical results from this belief, we cannot be entirely in accordance with him. In the above-mentioned page, and in other parts of the book, he laments the perverseness of the human race in putting aside the love of God to indulge in such a war as we have just experienced: but surely if it is really the case that the love of God is working its way in human souls to-day, it is certain that many have undertaken this war in the spirit of supreme love and sacrifice; even on the inadmissible hypothesis that there is some right on the side of the Germans, yet this had to be tested by the arbitrament of arms, and it is impossible to imagine that one of the greatest movements of humanity is being carried out contrary to the will of the Almighty. In fact, Mr. Hodgkin seems to think that the progress and influence of religion and ideas of God have very little influence on national life. On page 71 he says: "face the vested interests of your own town . . . the sweaters, the men who live by the shame of women, the publicans, and you shall know the fierce joy of being persecuted for Christ's sake." However, it is a common experience that these great evils are profoundly opposed by public opinion. On page 53, he writes: "It is a matter for common knowledge that the ordinary presentation of religion is not real. It is surrounded with subterfuge and sham . . . it is couched in language that is out of date and meaningless to any who have not been brought up to drink it in." Yet Mr. John Richard Green, the historian, writes of the English Bible, "As a mere literary monument the English version of the Bible remains the noblest example of the English tongue, while its perpetual use made it from the instant of its appearance the standard of our language." It is also generally admitted that the language of the English Prayer Book is little inferior: it is to be noted that Mr. Hodgkin paraphrases most of his quotations from the Testament. It is really somewhat difficult to reconcile the statements of the writer of the last two chapters with opinions stated in those at the beginning. There is some truth in many of the charges laid by Mr. Hodgkin at the door of the modern churches, that of inertia, lack of freedom, and content in an easy life being those which he chiefly lays stress upon. We would ask, however, is the way of life really easy in these days? Is it only by adopting some great cause that man can bear the cross and feel the need of a Saviour? Do not temptation and difficulty, needing the constant aid of prayer and the sacraments of religion, constantly beset our path? Even the conflict of opinions

between Mr. Hodgkin and many of those who read this book would seem to show this.

* * *

In "Darkest Christendom" (Messrs. George Allen & Unwin, price 7s. 6d. net) we get the note of sincerity. When a writer naïvely confesses to have shivered, shed tears, and fervently prayed at certain junctures in his life, which to some would have seemed not quite sufficiently important for these emotions, one cannot help feeling that he is expressing himself from his heart. The title is a gloomy one, and Mr. Arthur Bertram takes a terribly despondent view of the state of England before, and after, the war. Hardly any institution, public man, or association of persons—many of whom are generally considered typically English, seem according to the writer to have done their duty or acted with common-sense: "Our politics to-day are very, very bad," Mr. Bertram writes on page 85; and on page 144 he adds: "It can hardly be gainsaid that as a nation, and as a race, we have learnt nothing, and less than nothing, from the war." However, there is much truth in many of Mr. Bertram's criticisms of various actions, such, for example, as where he says, "one of our crying sins is exploitation," and the whole book is written in a gossip, pleasant style, interspersed with quaint little bits of slang, scientific facts, some anecdotes racily told—mostly, it must be confessed, of a horrible character; he passes too from one popular fault to another with such facility that we have no time to be bored. In fact, one might almost liken Mr. Bertram to a moralising Pepys writing severely. In this light the book may be said to be a worthy one, but it cannot be taken as a real contribution to thoughtful ethics. What is its special fault is the sweeping statements made. We have already given one or two examples, but there are many others of a much more definite character, which could not be made by a writer of serious powers of judgment. Thus, on page 97, Mr. Bertram writes: "The 'respectable' classes can be convicted out of their own mouths of being our chief cause of whatever is wrong in the state of society." On page 50, "Had the nations generally . . . been guided primarily and mainly by reasonably moral instincts, the motives for war would not have existed, war would have been impossible." On page 164, "In short, without unmasking any further details, the ineptitude and villainies of the members of both chambers, let us frankly admit that among the whole crowd Lord Milner is the only true British patriot, and Sir Edward Carson the only genuine democrat, and what are they among so many?" This seems nonsense. However, it is gladly to be noticed that at the close of the book the author does not endeavour to devise a scheme of his own to remedy the bad state of affairs, but recommends a fuller realisation of the Christian doctrines as the only solution.

* * *

Mr. Robert Rawson, in "Unfoldings in Romans: A Simple Exposition of Chapters i. to viii." (Morgan & Scott, 3s. net), declares that "a true understanding of this Epistle enables us to grasp the fundamental truths of our common Christianity, and is essential to an intelligent comprehension of the further truths revealed to us through the Apostle Paul in Ephesians and Colossians." Romans shows that "the sinner, who has no righteousness of his own, is declared by a righteous judge to be righteous through simply believing." Mr. Rawson compares this with the doctrine laid down in Hebrews: "Romans let us out of jail; Hebrews says we must be holy, and takes us home to be children in the Father's house, and shows us how to behave like children." The expositions are suited to quite young people, and deserve careful study.

1919

THE CONTEMPORARY REVIEW.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY.

No. 642.

June, 1919.

1. OUR FINANCIAL PLIGHT.
By The Right. Hon. WALTER RUNCIMAN
2. PROSPECTS IN RUSSIA.
By Sir PAUL VINOGRADOFF
3. THE GERMANS AT VERSAILLES.
By SISLEY HUDDLESTON
4. WHITHER DRIETS INDIA?
By St. NIHAL SINGH
5. THE FUTURE OF TURKEY.
By H. CHARLES WOODS
6. SOUTH AFRICA: A GOLDEN OPPORTUNITY.
By JOHN H. HARRIS
7. THE EMPLOYMENT OF THE WAR DISABLED.
By H. SIDEBOTHAM
8. MR. CHAMBERLAIN'S AFTER-WAR BUDGET.
By W. M. J. WILLIAMS
9. ART IN FRANCE DURING THE WAR.
By The COUNT de SOISSONS
10. THE RELIGION OF ROBINSON CRUSOE.
By the Rev. Dr. JAMES MOFFATT
11. THE CENTENARY OF CHARLES KINGSLEY.
By LEWIS MELVILLE
12. THE ILLIBERAL NATURE OF THE ANTI-VIVISECTION
CAMPAIGN.
By W. M. BULLOCK, M.D.
13. HINDRANCES TO BELIEF IN IMMORTALITY.
By the Rev. Dr. SAMUEL McCOMB
14. THE REVOLT OF THE HIDDEN HAND.
By WILLIAM HILL
15. LITERARY SUPPLEMENT:
THE AUDACIOUS TWINS.
By J. F. G. de MONTMORENCY

REVIEWS OF BOOKS: THE OXFORD HISTORY OF INDIA; THE
RISORGIMENTO; AN ENGLISH PRISON; OXFORD AFTER THE WAR; THE
VENERABLE BEDE.

INDEX TO VOL. CXV.

NEW YORK
LEONARD SCOTT PUBLICATION COMPANY

Barr Ferree, Prop.
249 WEST 13th STREET

\$6.00 per Annum.

Single Copy 75 Cents

Entered as second-class matter, January 22, 1889, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under
the Act of March 3, 1879

The Original Edition printed in England and issued in America by Authority
of the English Publishers

LONDON: THE CONTEMPORARY REVIEW COMPANY, LTD.

Canada: \$6.35 per Year; Single Copy 75 Cents.

GREAT BOOKS ON THE GREAT WAR

The Grand Fleet, 1914

By Admiral Viscount Jellicoe of Scapa

A record of the work of the Grand Fleet of world-wide interest. It is not only the first book dealing with the sea war written by one having a full knowledge of the facts, but by reason of the position of the author it is an historical document of unique value. A book of the utmost importance. Maps and illustrations.

Price, \$6.00 net; carriage extra

Forty Days in 1914

By Major-General Sir Frederick B. Naurice

An authoritative explanation as to why the Germans did not reach Paris in the first drive. An official story of the first importance, here first authoritatively told. Maps.

Price, \$2.00 net; carriage extra

The Way to Victory

By Philip Gibbs

The history of the great German offensive by the distinguished English war correspondent. The victorious ending of the war brought down to the last day. Maps and diagrams. 2 vols.

Price, \$5.00 per set; carriage extra

Leonard Scott Publication Co., 249 West 13th Street, New York

SCHOOLS

New Jersey

College of St. Elizabeth

Convent Station, New Jersey

45 Minutes from New York

Catholic College for Women

Registered by Regents

Standard College Preparatory Courses

Academy of St. Elizabeth

Send for Catalogue

Ohio

Art Academy of Cincinnati

Thoroughly Equipped Art School

Winter and Summer Term

J. H. GEST, Director

CINCINNATI

New York

Saint Mary's School Mount Saint Gabriel

PEEKSKILL-ON-THE-HUDSON, N. Y.

Boarding School for Girls

Under the charge of the Sisters of St. Mary.

New fireproof building beautifully situated

For catalogues address *The Sister Superior.*

SCHOOLS

California

California Hospital, Los Angeles

School for Nurses The most noted private hospital

in this beautiful residence city.

Medical, Surgical, Maternity, Eye and Ear and X-Ray Departments. In the midst of tropical gardens. Booklets free. 1414 South Hope St., Los Angeles. Also a limited number of young men (High School Graduates) admitted to a two years' course.

University of Southern California (Los Angeles)

COLLEGES—Liberal Arts, Medical, Dentistry, Pharmacy, Law, Music, Fine Arts, Oratory and Theology.

HIGH STANDARDS in Scholarship and Morals. Expenses moderate. Climate unexcelled. 3100 Students. Send for Catalogue.

Pres. GEORGE F. BOVARD, A.M., D.D., LL.D.
University Avenue

Oregon

University of Oregon—Eugene

Graduate School Summer School
College of Liberal Arts School of Medicine
College of Engineering School of Law
School of Education School of Music

Send for Catalog Address THE REGISTRAR

BOOKS OF TIMELY INTEREST

THEODORE ROOSEVELT

The Life of Theodore Roosevelt

By W. D. Draper

A vivid narrative by a competent writer. With introduction of Ex-President Taft, who says that in Mr. Roosevelt "the nation has lost the most commanding, the most original, the most interesting and the most brilliant personality in American public life since Lincoln." A book of sterling merit and of the utmost importance.

Price, \$2.25 net; carriage extra

John C. Winston Co.

By Secretary Daniels

The Navy and the Nation

By Josephus Daniels

A collection of addresses during the German War. They show a fine spirit of co-operation which the Secretary of the Navy inspired in citizen and sailor alike. A valuable contribution to war topics by the executive head of the American Navy in its greatest war.

Price, \$2.00 net; carriage extra

George H. Doran Co.

By Cecil Chesterton

A History of the United States

By Cecil Chesterton

An illustration of a fresher and much franker version of the invaluable Anglo-American friendship. A remarkably brilliant sketch of the history of the United States, written during the German War by an English soldier who died in France after the fighting. Introduction by Gilbert K. Chesterton.

Price, \$2.50 net; carriage extra

George H. Doran Co.

Abraham Lincoln's Romance

The Soul of Ann Rutledge

By Bernie Babcock

The story of Lincoln's love for Ann Rutledge and its moulding power on his after-life, now first told in sympathetic detail. A book of compelling charm.

Price, \$1.50 net; carriage extra

J. B. Lippincott Co.

By Sir Arthur Pearson

Victory Over Blindness

By Sir Arthur Pearson

The remarkable and romantic story of Sir Arthur Pearson's work of restoration to happy usefulness of those in all walks of life who have been bereft of the blessing of sight. An inspiring and ennobling record.

Price, \$1.50 net; carriage extra

George H. Doran Co.

LEONARD SCOTT PUBLICATION CO.

249 West 13th Street, New York

The Treaty of Peace

The Fortnightly Review

THE TREATY OF VERSAILLES

By J. A. R. Marriott, M.P.

THE OLDER EUROPEAN ORDER: A RETROSPECT.

By the Rt. Hon. Sir Frederick Pollock, P.C.

THE FUTURE OF RUSSO-GERMAN RELATIONS

By Politicus

PEACE AND A NAVAL HOLIDAY

By Archibald Hurd

AFTER-THE-WAR FINANCE. By H. J. Jennings

The Nineteenth Century and After

RUSSIA, GERMANY, AND THE ALLIES:

1. The Real Russian Peril

By John Pollock

2. "S.O.S."

By Leonid Andreev

3. German Diplomacy and the Bolsheviks: Some New Facts

By V. Poliakoff

HOW TO SAVE DEMOCRACY

By Harold F. Wyatt

Recent Articles

THE BRITISH EMPIRE AND THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

By the Right Rev. Bishop Frodsham (lately Bishop of North Queensland).

The Nineteenth Century

POLAND: THE CRIME OF PARTITION.

By Joseph Conrad

The Fortnightly Review

WESTERN AND EASTERN IDEALS IN RUSSIA. By Professor Sir Paul Vinogradoff

The Fortnightly Review

THE PEACE CONFERENCE: AN ESTIMATE OF FORCES

By A. F. Whyte

The Contemporary Review

PRESIDENT WILSON IN EUROPE AND AMERICA

By S. K. Ratcliffe

The Contemporary Review

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

A Voice from the Past

By Harold Spender

Contemporary Review.

IS A LEAGUE OF NATIONS ILLUSORY?

By J. G. S. MacNeill

Fortnightly Review.

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS IN JEOPARDY

By J. Macdonnell

Contemporary Review.

OUTLINES FOR A PERMANENT PEACE

By G. Stewart

Fortnightly Review.

LEONARD SCOTT PUBLICATION COMPANY

249 West 13th Street, New York

